DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 092 035 HE 005 596

TITLE	The Social Responsibility of the University in Asian Countries - Obligations and Opportunities. Papers-12.
INSTITUTION	International Association of Universities, Paris (France).
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	123p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Graduates; *College Role; *Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; Labor Market; *Social Responsibility; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Asia

ABSTRACT

These papers discuss the obligations and opportunities resulting from the social responsibility of the university in Asian countries. Papers cover the university, language and national identity; the university, its graduates and the labor market; and the university, its innovatory role in society. (MJM)

ED 092033

International Association of Universities

PAPERS-12

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

-Obligations and Opportunities-

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
International assn of universities
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 005 596

PARIS 1973

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

- Obligations and Opportunities -

ED 092035

PAPERS
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

No. 12

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNIVERSITY IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

- Obligations and Opportunities -

1, rue Miollis
75015 Paris
1973

The French edition of this volume is published under the title:
La responsabilité sociale de l'Université dans les pays d'Asie
- Ses obligations et ses chances -

The designations employed in this volume do not imply any expression of opinion on the part of the International Association of Universities concerning the legal status of any country, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitations of the frontiers of any country or territory.
The opinions expressed are those of the participants and do not engage the responsibility of the Administrative Board of IAU. They are published in this form for the information of all interested in the subject of the seminar.

ISBN 92 - 9002 - 122 - 5
French Edition : ISBN 92 - 9002 - 222 - 1
© Copyright by the International Association of Universities, 1973.

CONTENTS

Pages

Foreword 7

Introductory Note 9

Inaugural Session 13

Prof. Veli Merikoski, President, International Association of Universities 13

Prof. Ungku A. Aziz, Vice-Chancellor, University of Malaya 15

Tun Haji Abdul Razak, Prime Minister of Malaysia 16

The University, Language and National Identity 21

Prof. Ungku A. Aziz, Vice-Chancellor, University of Malaya 21

Mr. Jens Pinholt, Department of Ethnography, University of Aarhus 32

Discussion 42

The University, its Graduates and the Labour Market 51

Prof. H.L. Singh, Department of History, Banaras Hindu University 51

Discussion 61

The University, its Innovatory Role in Society 69

Prof. J.D. Legge, Department of History, Monash University 69

Discussion 77

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 89
- General Discussion 89
- Secretariat Aide-mémoire 97
- Closing Discussion 101

APPENDICES

- List of Participants 118
- Working Programme 110
- Outline for Paper on the University, its Innovatory Rôle in Society, by Dr. Z. SALAZAR, Department of History, University of the Philippines 111
- Note on the University, Language and National Identity, by Dr. KASEM SUWANAGUL, Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University 113
- Note on Tertiary Education and National Development, by Dr. SEAH CHEE-MEOW, Department of Political Science, University of Singapore 115

FOREWORD

The purpose of this brief foreword is to express thanks to the hosts, participants and organizers of the seminar recorded in this volume. This was done at various times in the course of the seminar itself; and therefore needs no repetition at length here.

But one of the special satisfactions to me of my period as President of IAU is proving to be the interest provoked by these new ventures in the Association's activities—the series of three international seminars whose themes are in part a preparation for the General Conference to be held in Moscow in 1975.

This one was the second of the series. IAU was most fortunate in having the help of the University of Malaya in holding it and that of eminent academic personalities from all parts of the world in taking part in its work. I would like them to accept this renewed expression of the Association's gratitude.

Veli Merikoski.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The second IAU Seminar took place from 29 January to 2 February 1973 at the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur. Its purpose was to study three topics of special importance for higher education in Asian countries. They were:

— The University, Language and National Identity;

— The University, its Graduates and the Labour Market;

— The University, its Innovatory Rôle in Society.

In examining these questions, participants were asked to keep in mind that universities have a dual responsibility. On the one hand, they must respond to new demands for graduates with the specialized skills needed to meet the increasingly sophisticated requirements of government, industry and agriculture—an obligation which weighs heavily on their limited human and material resources in many countries. On the other hand, universities are believed to have an inherent responsibility for maintaining and improving what is called the "quality of life" and from their special position as centres for the advancement of knowledge they should, therefore, be able to make an important contribution to the shaping of policy in matters of national, regional and international concern.

By giving each of its seminars a number the International Association of Universities wishes to emphasize that they are not isolated random events but form part of a coherent series. The first, which was held at the University of Constance in October 1971, took the proposals for the establishment of *Gesamthochschulen* in the Federal Republic of Germany as a basis for an examination of "Problems of Integrated Higher Education". This theme is apparently so different from the one chosen for the Kuala Lumpur seminar that the element of continuity may not at first be evident. In fact, the Administrative Board of IAU decided quite deliberately that because the Association is a worldwide body, the first seminar should take place in a "developed" country and the second in a "developing" country. And if the two seminars are examined more closely it will be seen that although they were directed to problems at different stages of evolution, the problems themselves were closely related, if not identical. Language was not discussed as such in Constance, where attention was directed more particularly to the organization of the structures and the utilization of the means of higher education. But language itself is a means of higher education—a prime resource and an irreplaceable tool. It may even be said to constitute one of the basic structures of higher education. The process of analysing and re-synthesizing reality which flows through the complex of university faculties, departments and institutes itself originates in language, which is not only at the very source of creative thought but an ever-present factor conditioning its further development. It is thus of the utmost importance for young universities to achieve complete mastery of this prime resource and to integrate this basic structure into their own being, while at the same time becoming themselves integrated into the nation.

Language, it can be seen, raises problems of integration.

There was also a very full discussion at Constance of graduate employment and of the central question of the innovatory rôle of the university in society, although the context was quite different.

The element of continuity is no less apparent in the common methodology of the two seminars. This was conditioned by two considerations—one, the value of examining particular examples of problems; the other the usefulness of studying them in general terms. Both seminars thus set out

— to examine selected problems through a study of examples taken from the day-to-day life of particular societies and universities;
— to use the examination of a specific situation as a basis for an international discussion involving the participation of academic staff from universities in other parts of the world, particularly from countries with which the host country is not normally in regular contact.

This approach provides a sound and well-informed basis for discussion, and at the same time allows for the enrichment of the debate through the interplay of opinions and experience from other settings. In addition, co-operation between IAU and its members is strengthened and opportunities created for the development of new patterns of inter-university co-operation to supplement existing links, many of which originated in the vicissitudes of history and political relations.

The detailed composition of the seminar is shown in the list of participants which is included as an appendix to this report.

⁂

This introductory note cannot attempt to evaluate the work accomplished, but it is perhaps appropriate to present a number of impressions based on the IAU Secretariat's experience of other international meetings and discussions. The first of these is the remarkable confidence which the universities of South East Asia seem to have in themselves and in their mission within society. Their optimism perhaps grows in proportion to the magnitude of their responsibilities. They have so much to do, and this is so patently obvious, that they do not pause to question the need for their existence. They have so much to do, that the most important thing appears to be to get down to work and to perfect their tools and methods as they use them. This is why questions of structure, which were uppermost at Constance, were relegated to second place at Kuala Lumpur, where the first concern was with questions of function. Universities in "developed" countries are obliged to pay special attention to their structures, and to their autonomy, because they are often very old and run a great risk of sclerosis. They are also situated in the midst of highly institutionalized environments, the ramifications of which can be excessively restrictive. Institutional overcrowding is one among the many forms of overcrowding caused by development. In South East Asia, this struggle between institutions competing for more living space is not yet acute. The universities do not feel that they are hemmed in on all sides and perhaps this is why they are less worried about matters of "autonomy".

These remarks do not apply to all universities in developing countries. The attitude of Indian universities to many questions appears to be quite different from that of universities in Malaysia and Indonesia for example. There is, in fact, no justification for attempting to classify all universities in developing countries in one group and all those in developed countries in another. Nevertheless, this dichotomy appeared frequently during the seminar discussions and will thus be reflected in this report. Unfortunately, it tends to use "development"—usually implying a certain type of industrial development—as an absolute criterion valid in all spheres of life, one which creates an almost metaphysical differentiation between countries. An alternative must really be found to the crude practice of using tons of steel as a measure for distinguishing between countries.

⁂

None of the problems considered gave rise to a discussion in which two distinct lines of argument could be identified, one belonging to the developed countries and the other to the developing countries. The present report therefore cannot take the same form as the Constance report in which it was possible to present, on the one hand, the views of the proponents of the *Gesamthochschule* and on the other, those of its opponents. The variety of views and opinions expressed in Kuala Lumpur was such that it appeared preferable to present the report as a day-to-day record with the full texts of the introductory speeches preceding the accounts of the discussions which followed them. One of the introductory speeches could not be delivered, but an outline of it is included as an appendix.

To summarize, no less than to translate, is to falsify, and the Secretariat asks the indulgence of any participants who feel that their ideas, as here presented, have been impoverished or distorted. But to have reproduced the discussions verbatim would still have been to falsify, for the spoken word can never pass unchanged into the written word. Plato, the most distinguished of all chroniclers, was criticized for not having captured the liveliness of the dialogues of Socrates, it being claimed that the most interesting conversation, when transposed, becomes like a picture in perspective—everything is either too long or too short.

Where Plato may have failed, the authors of this report make no claim to have succeeded. They hope, however, that they have produced an acceptable document, and one which may serve to stimulate further discussion.

They thank all those who helped them in their task, first in organizing the seminar and then in recording its work. The Secretariat is deeply indebted to the participants and particularly to the members of the University of Malaya for their friendly and efficient co-operation.

INAUGURAL SESSION

The seminar was officially opened on Monday, 29 January by the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Tun Haji Abdul Razak, who was accompanied by Dato Hussein bin Onn, Minister of Education. The session took place at the University of Malaya in the presence of members of the diplomatic corps and representatives of the political and university life of Malaysia.

The President of IAU, Professor Veli Merikoski, explained that the purpose of the seminar was to promote the discussion of university problems not simply in general terms but in the context of countries and institutions where they had a special urgency and a specific character. The Association was most grateful to the Government of Malaysia and to the University of Malaya for the interest they had shown in the seminar, and for their generous help and hospitality.

The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malaya, Professor Ungku Aziz, welcomed all participants on behalf of the staff and students of the University of Malaya. In the words of Confucius, they were delighted to have friends come from distant places.

In his opening address the Prime Minister referred to the importance of the theme of the seminar for the Government and Universities of Malaysia. As a former Minister of Education and as Chancellor of the newly established National University of Malaysia, he had a deep personal interest in each of the topics selected for discussion.

⁂

PROFESSOR VELI MERIKOSKI

President

International Association of Universities

It is a great privilege for the International Association of Universities to be able to hold its second seminar at the University of Malaya. I am saying this not only because the University provides a most pleasant and stimulating setting for our discussions, but also because its Vice-Chancellor, Professor Ungku Aziz, was one of the distinguished participants in the first seminar. He is a very good and, I should think, fastidious judge of the quality of intellectual debate. The fact that he so gracefully agreed to act as host to the second one is an indication not only of his generosity but also, I hope, of his appreciation of the work done at the University of Constance in the Federal Republic of Germany. He would not, I am sure, give his support to an activity he considered likely to be a more or less well organized waste of time. We are grateful to him, among many other things, for this kind of encouragement.

The purpose of the IAU seminars is to bring about more direct co-operation between the Association and its own members. We wish to promote the international discussion of university problems not simply in general terms, but within the context of institutions and countries where they have a special urgency and a specific character. International meetings sometimes lack reality because they are held in places physically or psychologically remote from the actual difficulties they are trying to examine and remedy. The neutral, extra-territorial and protected headquarters of the big international organizations are of course a very necessary commodity in the modern world and IAU is indeed well placed to recognize their value, but their very neutrality tends to make for abstraction and to filter or exclude certain aspects of life.

Now I think it can be said that abstraction, the failure to capture what is most distinctive and unique in each particular situation, all too readily affects international co-operation and reduces its usefulness. A sort of international pseudo-culture, often made up of the most trivial and vulgar aspects of the civilizations of the rich countries, has become all-pervasive in the world today. The mass-media, certain aspects of modern technology and, no doubt, commercial motives tend to spread it across most of our nations and societies. This provides a kind of easy and often delusive common ground which at first sight facilitates international co-operation. The danger is of course that international co-operation itself should contribute to this and thus to the suffocation of the national or regional culture that lies underneath, cut off from the fresh air and the breezes of exchange.

This brings me to the topics we are going to discuss at this seminar. Language is obviously a vital element of the national culture. Language is not simply a way of naming things; it also suggests specific links between the things it names and thus carries an implicit philosophy which the individual mind can then work out and develop. Each language must thus be seen as a unique source of thought, feeling and creation. It is therefore a great impoverishment if the national language is only used for the practical requirements of day-to-day life and is banished from the sphere of culture. An international language, however perfect, can never take its place and it is perhaps to be feared that the continuous and unconsidered use of an international language might in the long run pollute and dry up the unique source I was referring to a moment ago.

There is also a danger that a nation that does not fully master its own tools of thought, expression and invention may also lose the mastery of its own modes of production and exchange and therefore of its economic life. Certainly the revival of national culture is not enough to help all countries to regain full control of their development and to avoid the worst imbalances and wastes, such as graduate unemployment. But the two problems are linked and it is certainly the duty of the universities to help their people to conquer autonomy and self-government in both related fields.

Finally, it is obvious that the power of innovation must be crippled by the inability to tap the deeper resources of one's own culture. It is not for me to speak about innovation in Asia but I wonder whether it does not partly involve a re-discovery and re-casting into new forms of some of the values of the past. You know that many people in the West, particularly young people, are growing increasingly uneasy about Western civilization and are now looking to the East for new ways of life. Most of them have very confused ideas about Asia but there is a general feeling that it can contribute a great deal to the whole of human culture.

Having the good fortune to be guests of your country, we all, I am sure, share this feeling. We will be a little less confused, I hope, in a week from now and in a better position to thank you for all the things we will have learnt from you. But we have already begun to enjoy Malaysian hospitality and I should like to express our very sincere gratitude for the interest that the Government of Malaysia and the University of Malaya have shown in the work of our Association. The Prime Minister has kindly agreed to attend and address this opening meeting and we are most thankful to him, as well as honoured. His presence among us this morning is indeed the most convincing mark of the Malaysian Government's concern for university affairs and international co-operation. The Minister of Education is also with us and I should like to thank him most warmly for his co-operation.

I have already tried to express some of our gratitude to Professor Ungku Aziz. We are also deeply indebted to many of his colleagues at the University. I cannot thank them all personally here, but I am sure that we will find the opportunity to do so later this week. With the very generous and competent help of our hosts, I am confident that our work will be fruitful. But before starting our discussions, we shall now have the privilege of listening to them.

PROFESSOR UNGKU A. AZIZ

Vice-Chancellor

University of Malaya

It is my pleasant privilege to welcome you to Malaysia and to say "Selamat Datang Ke Malaysia".

All of us in the University of Malaya feel greatly honoured by the decision of the Administrative Board of IAU to hold the second in its series of seminars at our University.

My own feelings have been better expressed some 2500 years ago by Confucius. In the second sentence of the First Book of the Lun Yu or Analects the Master says, "Is it not delightful to have friends come from distant places ?"

In the international fraternity of universities all of us are friends—academics or undergraduates—we have the beautiful ability to enter into instant discussion on an infinite variety of topics—because we belong to one of the friendliest of institutions that have survived during man's known period of civilization, namely the universities.

This seminar which brings to Kuala Lumpur participants from such distant places as Ghana, Moscow, Tokyo and New York has as its general theme "The Social Responsibility of the University in Asian Countries". We all know that the universities of Asia are deeply concerned with the obligations and responsibilities that have arisen especially during the last decade as a result of the social responsibilities that the university has had to accept.

Some universities have bravely set forth to take up willingly such responsibilities—others like Shakespeare's Malvolio have had responsibilities thrust upon them.

Whatever the case may be, for the next few days this seminar is committed to devote its attention to a theme a day for three days.

Language and national identity—the market for graduates and, at a more abstract lèvel, the innovatory rôle of the university in society.

We are confident that with the congregation of so many outstanding academic talents, from such a diversity of university situations, it augurs well for a productive seminar.

Inasmuch as we expect the meeting of minds to result in a melding or possibly even in a melting of ideas, we are also providing some opportunities for recreation and entertainment during the seminar evenings and for learning about Malaysia's system of planning and development administration during the free periods and after the seminar is concluded, for those who wish to stay on with us.

Perhaps, on the entertainment note, I should mention that not only will the participants be able to hear our top singers performing Ghazal music, which we think is one of our classical forms, but we have been able to obtain from the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports the specially trained dance troupe who will entertain you with the Tari Asyik or Dance of Passionate Love.

And to prove that we really love our splendid visitors, our students will perform three dances for them. The specially trained dance group of the University of Malaya Students' Union have kindly agreed to sacrifice a part of their vacation and to stay back so as to be able to entertain our international guests with a variety of Malaysian dances. I am sure all of you who are heads of universities will truly appreciate what I am saying when I say I am sincerely grateful to the undergraduates for their support on this important occasion. Incidentally, the President of UMSU will be an observer at our seminar, together with one of the leaders of another student organization.

I would like to take this occasion, however briefly, to thank all the staff of the University of Malaya who have worked together for long hours—through final examinations—to render this seminar operational. We would also like to mention our appreciation of the friendly guidance from our colleagues from the headquarters of IAU in Paris.

I should like to say a special "Selamat Datang" to the President of IAU—Professor V. Merikoski—who has come to Malaysia all the way from Finland.

As the Vice-Chancellor of the host university I would like to express my gratitude to the Prime Minister for sparing some of his valuable time to grace this occasion with his presence and to declare the seminar open.

Before concluding, I feel that one important Malaysian guest would not mind it if I mention that the Minister of Education, Dato Hussein bin Onn, is attending his first official function in his new status as Al-Haj—having returned from completing the Pilgrimage to Mecca a few days ago. We hope that a few of the richly accumulated blessings—Berkat—that he has brought home will touch this seminar and be omens of success and goodwill.

Once again Ladies and Gentlemen, friends, may our seminar be useful and fruitful.

TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK

Prime Minister of Malaysia

It is an honour and a real pleasure for me to be here this morning to declare open your seminar. Indeed, it is a rare occasion that we have gathered here in Kuala Lumpur so many distinguished scholars from friendly countries far and near. I heartily share the sentiments expressed by the Chairman that in choosing Kuala Lumpur as the venue for this seminar, your Association—The International Association of Universities—has accorded Malaysia a signal honour, and in particular this University of Malaya. I have no doubt that everything possible is being done to make your brief stay in our Capital both pleasant and memorable.

I am particularly happy that this seminar has given an opportunity to our newly established institutions of higher learning, namely the Universiti Kebangsaan, Universiti Pertanian and the Institut Teknoloji Kebangsaan, to take part in your deliberations side by side with older established institutions such as the Moscow State University as well as more recent ones like the Université nationale du Zaïre. I am confident that you and all will benefit tremendously from the exchange of ideas and experiences in your deliberations during the next few days.

Having been at one time Minister of Education and now Chancellor of the Universiti Kebangsaan of Malaysia, I have always maintained an abiding interest in higher education. I am therefore very keenly interested in the theme of your seminar—The Social Responsibility of the University in Asian Countries : Obligations and Opportunities—which I think is very appropriate in the context of our endeavour to create a new social order and build a better world for mankind.

As I see it, the most universal characteristic of the past decade has been the thrust of change and rapid progress in the field of higher learning, both among the developed as well as the developing nations. While the causes and consequences of the change may have differed from one country to another, the fact remains that very few have escaped the compelling circumstances which underline the need for change in one form or another.

There are, admittedly, divergent views as to the true rôle of the University and its responsibility to the society which it is meant to serve. I am reminded of the debate which was widely publicized in the United States some years ago, where on the one hand it was argued that as a result of its deep involvement with the problems of society, the university has been diverted from its primary rôle of teaching. On the other hand, it was equally strongly argued that the university must not only transmit knowledge but must at the same time apply that knowledge to urgent social problems.

I am personally inclined to the second viewpoint since many of us, particularly in developing countries whether in Asia or elsewhere, are well aware of the need for our universities to undertake special obligations for economic, social and even political changes. As we know, the university has within it the climate and around it the prestige that gives it special leverage in confronting social problems. In the process of its growth the university would have obtained, both from indigenous sources and outside, a substantial reservoir of the particular kind of human talent required for dealing with the problems of society as distinguished from other fields. Other than the government itself, no other institution would focus attention and energy on the design of a national educational programme or the pressing demand of maintaining our ecological balance or on the formulation of foreign policy. In short, the university must necessarily have the body of men and women who are concerned with and are competent to give informed and intelligent views on such problems.

However, what is of immediate interest to me or any leader of government is that the young men and women who are to implement the plans for development will in the main have to come from the university—i. e. from our own universities. They need to be prepared adequately and realistically for the responsibilities which lie ahead of them after leaving the portals of learning. That phase of their lives is crucial and indeed the kind of product that they turn out to be would depend a great deal in their ability to inculcate in them the discipline of objectivity nurtured by the university besides the benefit they can derive from the unexhaustible reservoir of learning and research.

I am happy to say that our universities have admirably adjusted their rôle to meet the nation's demand in terms of preparing and providing educated and trained manpower. In order to provide the realistic training, it is important that the university should come out of the artificial ivory tower which was characteristic of the colonial regime. Today many of our Asian universities are giving the students and the staff direct experience of social action and development work as part of the normal teaching process.

In the final analysis, the university can only be true to itself by its readiness to accept its burden of responsibility as determined by the society which supports it. The knowledge available at its command or within its reach can be mobilized in the national effort to achieve stable economic growth, to research into the social problems of our cities or into the causes of racial conflict. In other words, the university must inevitably be drawn into social issues and—as it is aptly put—become one of the active shapers of society.

Thus, during the present phase of our national development, and for some time to come, the nation necessarily expects our universities to accept increasing responsibility for moving ideas along the road to action, to develop the knowledge needed, and to apply this useful knowledge towards achieving our national objectives, i.e. creating a new social order when our people will enjoy a life of peace, prosperity and happiness.

I would also like to touch briefly on one of the three topics which will demand the focus of your attention during the next few days. While I do not wish to anticipate the trend of your deliberations, I would like nonetheless to offer some views on the subject.

Specifically, on the question of language and national identity, since achieving independence some fifteen years ago, we have pledged ourselves to put the national language—Bahasa Malaysia—in its rightful place as the sole official language of the nation. As we all know, since ancient times, this region was the focal point for at least three languages with roots in great civilizations of the past, namely Sanskrit, Chinese and Arabic. In later years, with the advent of Europeans into the Asian scene, European languages, such as English, left a lasting influence on our indigenous language.

Today we accept the fact that Malay is the national and sole official language of the country, while we permit the use of the Chinese and Tamil languages for unofficial purposes. This is clearly stipulated in our Constitution and in the Rukunegara, our national guiding principles.

As for English, we regard it as our link-language that will enable our people to have direct access to the vast reservoir of accumulated knowledge available today. It is true that there are several other great languages which can open the doors to modern science and technology, but for our present needs, we consider it sufficient for a limited number of scholars, technologists and administrators to be conservant with them.

It also might interest you to know that Bahasa Malaysia—our national language—is in the process of being scientifically developed so that by the middle-eighties, it will be the medium of instruction in our national education system from primary to postgraduate level. Meanwhile, it will play its important rôle in providing the stimulus to national unity and the basis for moulding our national identity.

Another significant development in this area is the linguistic unity that has taken place following the agreement between ourselves and Indonesia on a common spelling system and co-ordinated development of one language which will serve our 120 million people. In due time, the unified language will contribute to stability and progress of this region.

Once again I wish to say how happy I am at the opportunity of being with you this morning and to share some thoughts on the issues before us. On behalf of the Government and people of Malaysia, I wish to thank the International Association of Universities for having organized this seminar in collaboration with the University of Malaya.

It now gives me great pleasure to declare open this seminar and in doing so, I wish all of you success in your deliberations.

THE UNIVERSITY, LANGUAGE AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

The President of the Association, Professor V. Merikoski, opened the first discussion session and thanked those present for accepting the invitation of IAU to take part in the seminar. He proposed that a chairman be appointed for each of the five working days. He suggested the following: Dr. Kasem Suwanagul, Professor Hassan el Sherif, Dr. Cyril E. Fiscian, Professor K.A. Rybnikov and Dr. Robert F. Goheen. This proposal was accepted, and after Mr. Aitken, of the IAU Secretariat, had described briefly the background of the seminar and the plan proposed for its work, Dr. Kasem took the chair.

Dr. KASEM said that in ancient countries like Thailand it seemed that the sense of national identity could be taken as a matter of course. Language played a major rôle in this, particularly if the term was understood in a broad sense, not merely as a verbal structure, but also as a vehicle transmitting and generating ideas.

On closer examination, however, it quickly became clear that not all members of the community experienced a sense of national identity with the same intensity. In particular, very great differences in the spread of education led to the creation of marginal groups. In more specifically linguistic terms, those using dialects participated less fully in social debate. Especially in the poorer countries where there were practically no other institutions capable of disseminating culture, universities had a very important corrective rôle to play in improving this situation. On the one hand, universities should be set up in provinces remote from the capital—as had been done in Thailand—and on the other, it was imperative for them to train graduates able to communicate effectively with the people and hence able to use the national language to the full and, if necessary, to extend its resources.

He then invited Professor Ungku Aziz and Mr. Jens Pinholt to present the papers they had prepared for the seminar.

PROFESSOR UNGKU A. AZIZ

Vice-Chancellor
University of Malaya

The main orientation of this paper is towards an exploration of the ways by which the search for perceptible manifestations of national identity has influenced the development of the university, especially in the region of Southeast Asia and more generally in many of the developing countries. The paper also explores some of the reasons why language has become one of the most intense of these manifestations. By itself the paper is modestly presented as a launching-pad for discussion. It is not intended to be a compendium of final views on how language policy should be formulated in a university. With due regard for modesty, a number of examples are drawn from the writer's experience in the University of Malaya.

As a first step, our terms must be clarified. We can then examine the various ways in which the university influences and is influenced by certain categorical imperatives of language development. We can also gain some perspective of the national socio-political milieu in which the language issue or issues evolve in the conscious pursuit of national identity.

As a concept, national identity, like "national character" can either be explained in a few words or virtually discussed out of existence with voluminous qualifications and comparisons of usage by a variety of scholars. We shall have to be content with a relatively simple explanation. "National identity" becomes conceptually feasible when a nation (a) exists. To avoid becoming embroiled in terminological disputes, we shall affirm that in this paper we are only concerned with nations that are closely associated with states. Thus we shall be able to examine the relationship between the university and the state in matters of language and national identity.

If there is an identifiable nation then there will be identifiable national characteristics. These national characteristics could be aspects of national culture in the fine arts, customs, cuisine, literature, architecture, etc.

The national culture forms an emotional force that links or binds members of a nation together. The national culture separates the members of one nation from those who belong to another nation.

Sometimes the people of a given nation may be homogeneous in terms of physical appearence (e.g. negroid, mongoloid or caucasian). Although this is not an essential criterion, where anatomy and skin colour coincide with culture generally the sense of national identity tends to be stronger.

Among the many aspects of national culture, language seems to be the most important in the formation of national identity. There are exceptions in areas such as West Africa, the Caribbean and Papua and New Guinea.

In the political era following World War II, national identity has become a matter of critical significance to the new states as soon as they exist by virtue of a declaration of independence and by the consequent recognition by other states and by international authorities.

This overt stress on national identity by the new states which are invariably economically undeveloped or maldeveloped, should not make us lose sight of the more subtle ways by which the older states maintain their respective national identities. Thus in the USA and Denmark, apart from the hippies, the nationalistic use of the national flag is fairly widespread. The use of the French language by Frenchmen in international conferences is a rather sensitive issue and is a manifestation of their national image. The whole system of social relations would be quite unworkable for the Japanese if they were deprived of their language which provides perhaps the most sophisticated existing set of gradations of syntax and vocabulary for expressing different types and degrees of social relations.

(a) One definition of the term, "Nation" is, "A nation may be defined as the largest society (q.v.) of people united by a common culture and consciousness. While a nation occupies a common territory so that its members have common interests of place and land, the vital binding force of the nation is variously derived from a strong sense of its own history, its special religion, or its unique culture, including language. A nation may exist as an historical community and a cultural nexus without political autonomy or statehood." Ref: A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Gould & Kolb, Ed., UNESCO (1964), p. 451.

With ingenious restraint the English would like to leave their ex-colonial peoples with the indelible myths that (a) English is a world language, universally understood, and (b) one can only learn the modern knowledge that is the key to great technological advance and rapid economic development through the English language. In fact, to make a brief digression, anyone who has travelled in Germany or Latin America, not to mention China or Japan, will quickly realize that a large proportion of the world's population, including the native technocrats and intellectuals who are building strong modern states, do not comprehend English.

The second myth confuses medium for access to the treasure house of knowledge recorded in English with medium for teaching and learning, especially at the tertiary level of education. Indeed, this fallacy lies at the root of many emotional confrontations between protagonists in the language arenas in universities.

The second term which needs a modicum of clarification is "language". If we take a broad definition of language, then it would include not only the spoken and written forms but gestures (e.g. typical national gestures: the Mediterranean shrugging of the shoulders or the Japanese bowing), as well as forms of aural perception, music, song, including drum languages and touch. However, in this paper for reasons of economy in time and space we have to confine ourselves to the spoken and written forms of language.

Incidentally, we should note the close relationship between national identity and the sound of a language. The cultured Englishman modulates his speech to the tones and phrasing of what is thought to be the Oxford style of speaking. As Professor Higgins shows, accent can be related to class. One of the distinctive marks of a Chinese disciple of Maoism in Southeast Asia would be some competency for speaking Chinese with the four-tone system that is sometimes known as the Peking accent, or Mandarin or Gwoyou and now is simply called "Chinese".

Similarly, the form of writing, the orthography, has much to do with national identity and changes in the script of a language or even changes in the spelling system are often made so that there may be some desirable concomitant changes in national identity. Thus, the change from Gothic typography to sans serif in Germany and the widespread adoption of sansserif throughout Europe (including its adoption by the Unesco Courier) may be offered as a further evidence. As a typography that is modern, modernizing and pleasing to the eye, the change to sans serif is a feature of language change that is related to national identity.

The recent simplifications in the writing of Chinese characters or idiographs in the People's Republic of China as well as in Japan may be mentioned in this context. The impact of the introduction in the early part of the Heian period, of the hiragana and katakana syllabaries on the evolution of Japanese national culture and the consequent loosening of the Chinese cultural bondage of the national identity also deserves some consideration.

Then, we should realize that language (especially in a context where national identity is a hot issue in a university) is in a continuous state of flux. There is no likelihood of either vocabulary or syntax remaining static. Indeed, the furious growth of modern knowledge requires rapid expansion of national language. New ways of doing things require new ways of speaking and writing. Extreme examples are the language innovations created by the American astronauts. Their lives depend upon split-second efficient communication of messages. The technicalities of electronics require brevity and word forms that minimize the possibilities of linguistic confusion. For example, among the first conversations on the moon, Armstrong says to Aldrin, "... okay now drop your P.L.S.S. down. There you go, you're clear and spidery. You're good." (P.L.S.S. = Personal Life Support System). Terms like: "Roger" or "abort" are well known but A.O.S. (acquisition of signal) may become more familiar as space travel becomes more frequent.

The interchange of cultures brings an infusion not only of goods and concepts but of words that may take on different meanings. For example, take the Japanese hotel manager who apologetically informs his guests that breakfast is "viking" (pronounced "biking") because that morning the staff are on strike. He really means breakfast is on a self-service basis. In recent years smorgasbord introduced with Scandinavian decor in Japanese restaurants has brought the help-yourself-to-the-food notion, thus "self-service" became "biking". It is interesting to speculate why the older word "buffet" did not take on. Incidentally "self-service" would have been unsuitable because "service", pronounced "sabis", means "tips" in Japanese.

We shall assume that languages borrow from each other and that even a relatively high rate of borrowing does not dilute the reinforcement that language gives to national identity. Indeed, it may be argued that the greater is the capacity (and the need) to borrow words from other languages, the more lively is the national identity.

Having clarified our two main terms, we can now turn to the rôle of the university in developing the national language and fostering a sense of national identity, especially among the members of the university.

Although it would be utterly superfluous, if not impertinent, to try to define the university in a seminar organized by the International Association of Universities, it is germane to the aims of this paper to explain certain aspects of the national characteristics of the members of a university. Thus, the teaching staff may consist of nationals and non-nationals. The proportion of these two groups will be significant in deciding the initial formulation of the university's language policies and in the implementation of these policies. Further, in so far as some new states are concerned, there may be instances of nationals who do not speak the national language sufficiently well to be able to use it as a teaching medium. Similarly, the students can be divided into those who are native or indigenous and those who are not, together with sub-categories of those who are sufficiently familiar with the national language to be able to pursue their studies in it and those who cannot do so.

It might reasonably be expected that a university will conduct its business including its ceremonials in the national language.

Let us now examine what the university can do for the nation in the matter of language. We shall endeavour to orientate our examination to those aspects of language that contribute towards the formulation of national identity.

It will be seen that we are adopting the view that in a developing country a university must be engagé or committed towards national development both culturally as well as materially.

There are four aspects of language that the academic policy-makers of a university should give sufficient attention to:

1. The development of the national language.
2. The practical use of the national language for purpose of instruction.
3. Teaching the language so that it is not only a skill which improves the graduates' employment prospects but it also becomes a cohesive factor in national unity.
4. Teaching the effective use of international languages that open the doors to knowledge necessary for academic growth and national development.

Let us examine each of these topics in some detail.

1. *Language Development*

While the university may not be the only agency that can contribute towards the development of the national language, it is uniquely organized for influencing its development on a rather wide front as compared to most other agencies. In Southeast Asia, most states have a government agency that is concerned with the development of the national language. For example, in Burma there is the Burma Translation Society. Indonesia has the Lembaga Bahasa Nasional. In Malaysia, there is the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. These agencies have specialized staff to expand technical vocabularies and compile bilingual glossaries, encyclopaedias, documents, etc. Although its manpower resources may be relatively small, numerically, the university has the stimulus of the need for rapid development of terminology for use in teaching, research and textbook writing. It also has a relatively large number of experienced staff with high academic qualifications who can contribute directly towards language development. The decisive challenges from students who put the newly coined terms to test are invaluable in sifting out useful neologisms from constructions that are best suited for pedantic confabulations. Furthermore, academic controversy is a better method of testing than bureaucratic direction.

What can the university actually do? Firstly, it can help to form technical vocabularies, bilingual glossaries and specialized dictionaries. It can recommend the ways by which terms which do not exist in the national language should be constructed. For example, it can recommend how the economic concepts of "export" or "import" should be expressed and spelled in Malaysian (e.g. ekspot/impot). Or how the stock-market concept, in English, of "hedging" can be "lindong-nilai" in Malaysian (meaning, protection of value).

While new concepts are freely introduced, their terms can be either imported wholesale or with modifications in pronunciation or spelling. They can be clothed in existing National Language words or be neologisms that are utterly new (e.g. jabanah or *Ja*lan *Ba*wah Tan*ah* (meaning tunnel).

Or "berdikari" which is the English concept of " stand on your own feet". This is formed from "*Ber*diri *Di* atas *Ka*ki Sendi*ri*" in Indonesian and Malaysian. Occasionally, parts of foreign terms are related to the borrowed concept, e.g. in Japanese "depart" is derived from "department store".

As a small example of what one university in this region is doing, in the University of Malaya there are terminology committees in the different faculties. These committees have published science vocabularies comprising over 15,000 terms in Malaysian during the last two years.

How can a university do more than simply coin new terms? It can apply the combined forces of the intellectual talents of its highly qualified and experienced academic staff to the problems of national language development. A few examples of such activities could include :

(i) formation of efficient systems of spelling and orthography. Thus, it was the students and staff of the University of Malaya, then located in Singapore, that took the initiative in 1956 to organize a Language and Literature Congress where the main principles of the present Indonesia-Malaysia common spelling system were advocated in a paper submitted by the Malay Language Society of the University of Malaya (PBMUM).

(ii) research on dialects and other aspects of language and the formation of a grammar of a Standard National Language.

(iii) linguistic research to improve capacity to develop the National Language along scientific lines.

(iv) research into improved methods of teaching the National Language and of learning foreign languages by National Language speakers.

(v) organization of congresses, seminars and lectures to stimulate an objective academic approach to a subject that is fraught with political emotions.

2. *Instruction Media*

One gets the feeling that certain Europeans or Americans tend to judge a national language policy as being somewhat "ultranationalistic" or jingoistic if it is suggested that the medium of instruction in a university should be mainly in the national language. On the other hand, one knows that no British university would accept a lecturer into, say, a department of Asian History, who would only be prepared to teach Modern Asian History in, say, the Thai language. Outside specialist departments in postgraduate schools of Japanese studies in American universities, no professor would be employed who could only teach about the Modernization of Japan through the medium of Nihongo (Japanese language). While these types of Westerners are quite justified in their stand at home, some of them betray traces of language-arrogance when they come to the backward lands of Southeast Asia.

At the other end of the pole are the native ultranationalists who fondly believe that without much time for overcoming transitional problems, in one great leap forward, they could accomplish a language revolution. And, all students could learn all subjects in the National Language without any significant loss in the academic quality of the graduates.

What is the Confucian Golden Mean in this problem of using the National Language in tertiary education in the developing countries? That its use should be as widespread as possible should not be doubted. Since primary and secondary education are likely to be given in the National Language, it is rational to expect university students to think and write best in that language and not in a foreign language.

The balanced position has to provide adequate allowance in two respects. Firstly, as has been pointed out above, some competency in one international language such as English is essential to give students (and staff) a route to modern knowledge right up to its frontiers. Indeed, at the postgraduate level a working knowledge of several foreign languages may be essential.

Secondly, in the Southeast Asian developing countries in particular, for a long time to come there will be a shortage of qualified staff in certain fields. If students are adequately familiar with one foreign language then they can follow lectures and participate in tutorials and discussions with the imported foreign lecturers. There may even be cases where nationals have to be treated as imported foreigners when they are highly qualified in their respective subjects but because they have been abroad for long periods, are unfamiliar with their own National Language. It is essential that foreign academic staff be given clear unconditional assurances that they are welcome for the knowledge they bring and it is understood that they will teach in a certain foreign language. Similarly, the prerequisites of foreign language competency amongst students should also be without let or exception when such is academically necessary.

In the case of universities that were founded in the colonial period when the National Language of the metropolitan power was imposed on the university, then the transfer to the local National Language as a medium of instruction after independence requires an arrangement of suitable transitional provisions. Neither staff who have employment contracts with the university nor students who have matriculated or registered for specific courses can be abruptly compelled to carry out their tasks in the National Language. Nor should there be retrospective rules. Staff may be offered opportunities to learn the National Language to prepare themselves to use it as a teaching medium. The university should provide proper facilities for this. New students can be selected on a basis of language competency or they can be given training in the use of the National Language at various levels during their undergraduate studies. It seems desirable to make tests in the National Language an integral part of the degree examinations so that the students do not misunderstand the seriousness with which the university views the implementation of its National Language Policy.

Similarly, students who come up to the university with a relatively poor grasp of important foreign languages, such as English in particular, will need to be given special training in its usage in their earlier years of study so that they can travel the same routes at more or less the same speed as their more fortunate colleagues who have been to secondary schools where the foreign language was taught in a better way.

Realizing that this is a rather controversial issue, the writer would like to suggest that the acquirement of reading skills in a foreign language, including of course speed as well as comprehension, is more important than other skills such as writing or speaking in the earlier years of university studies. Therefore, the First Year course in learning English, say, should be mainly devoted to learning reading skills, with the other skills being postponed to the later years of study.

From our experience in the University of Malaya, it could be added that there is a wide range of teaching aids that can be used to overcome difficulties during the transitional phase. A translation of a fairly full summary of lectures is useful. This should be distributed well ahead. This can be provided either by pairing the foreign-speaking lecturer with a National Language speaker or by providing a translation service in a Language Centre.

Faculties should be adequately provided with necessary terminology for their work and should be assisted to publish texts in the National Language which are either original works or translations.

It may be mentioned that the University of Malaya has its own University of Malaya Press which aims to assist in providing such a service. In Malaysia too, the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka is active in the publication of academic texts in the National Language.

For weaker students, special tutorials can be arranged where tutors supplement the ordinary classes given in the faculty with extra tutorials in the National Language. Experience in the University of Malaya is that failure rates among specific groups have been drastically reduced during the last few years as a result of the provision of special systems of tutorials in the natural sciences in the National Language and even in English with simpler and more extensive explanations.

3. *Learning the National Language*

The methods of language teaching are too well known to be described here. The language laboratory and other teaching aids among the recent innovations that can be grouped under the heading "education technology" are essential facilities for language learning. Until the University of Malaya had a Language Centre it could not mobilize teaching resources satisfactorily. It could not provide all faculties with a wide range of teaching facilities and language services.

The types of national language classes needed vary from faculty to faculty. Even within the same faculty there may be considerable variations in standards of competency in Bahasa Malaysia. In Malaysia we have students from the East Malaysian States of Sabah and Sarawak who do not know any Malaysian at all. We have students from the English medium secondary schools who speak Malaysian English at home and know no other language though they may be of Indian or Chinese ethnic origin.

Nowadays, university entrants take a pre-entry National Language test so that we can gauge their level. They are set an objective multiple-choice type of question paper which has 90 questions that are marked by a computer. Twelve thousand, two hundred and seventy-one persons took this test in 1971 and in December 1972, 13,500 took the test.

Pupils in the Chinese medium secondary schools are taught in Chinese and have a relatively poor speaking and working knowledge of English and virtually no Malaysian.

Therefore, the university has to fill up the gaps. The aim should be that by the time a student graduates he has enough mastery of Malaysian to carry out his normal tasks in the language. That is, if he is a teacher then he can teach in this medium. If he is an executive he can deal with correspondence in Malaysian, attend meetings, conduct negotiations, etc., in Malaysian.

Bearing in mind that all official documents issued by the Government are now written in Malaysian and that an increasing number of meetings are held in Malaysian, it would be inconvenient not to have competency in the language. It would also be rather ridiculous for a doctor to have to call a nurse to interpret when talking to a patient who only speaks Malaysian. Or, it would be equally peculiar for a Malaysian engineer to have to issue instructions to workmen through a clerk because the engineer cannot speak Malaysian.

By the late '70s the whole secondary system will be taught in Malaysian. Therefore future school teachers now studying in the Faculty of Science, for example, need to be prepared by the university for that task, otherwise they may find themselves redundant.

There is also a need to teach undergraduates the use of the National Language in specialized areas. National Language for engineers or doctors or scientists or economists involves awareness of special terminology and specialized ways of expression. This knowledge is important not only for students but also for the staff.

In the rather exceptional case of Malaysia, there is at present no single language that all citizens can freely communicate in with each other at the level of, say, discussions on public affairs. Therefore it is essential for the university to prepare all the future leaders so that they can have at least one common language for communication between themselves and between them and the masses. It is estimated that less than 10 per cent of the population can communicate in the English language. Probably more than 90 per cent of the adult population understand Malaysian but this is only as a lingua franca for the market place and for an argument between, say, an Indian and a Chinese in a bus. It is not yet sufficiently understood for discussion at the "public level". A reading of the Parliamentary Reports during the last few years would give some picture of the capacity for National Language usage among the non-Malay Members of Parliament.

We are moving toward an era where élitism and exclusiveness is rapidly disappearing and if the university trained leaders do not play their rôle in leading the nation along the way of economic and social development then other less well-prepared leaders will thrust themselves forward. In this sense National Language preparation is not only a vital element in national identity formulation, it will also extend the possibility for trained leadership to operate in the administrative, executive and political areas.

In a multi-racial nation like Malaysia the existence of one binding National Language is a categorical imperative. From the common language comes a common awareness which ultimately develops into a commonly accepted national identity. This issue is considered so sensitive that any person who questions the substance of this in the Constitution may be charged with an offence under the Sedition Act, 1948 as amended by the Emergency (Essential Powers) Ordinance No. 45, 1970, or with an offence under any law made by Parliament prohibiting such questioning. Even members of the legislature questioning the substance of this article in

Parliament or any state Legislative Assembly will not be protected by privilege and may be prosecuted.

This does not mean that the languages of the various ethnic groups, be they Tamil or Punjabi Indians, Cantonese-speaking or Hokkien-speaking Chinese, or Javanese-speaking Indonesians, should be lost or even suppressed.

According to Article 152 of the Constitution of Malaysia, while the National Language shall be the Malay language, it is provided that:

"(a) no person shall be prohibited or prevented from using (otherwise than for official purposes), or from teaching or learning, any other language; and

(b) nothing in this Clause shall prejudice the right of the Federal Government or of any state Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any other community in the Federation."

Furthermore, the fourth Belief in the Declaration of the National Ideology (Rukunegara) states that the Malaysian nation is dedicated, "to ensuring a liberal approach to her rich and diverse cultural traditions". This is amplified in the official commentary as follows:

"We are dedicated to ensuring the existence and growth of a liberal society in which its members are free to practise and profess their own religions, customs and cultures consistent with the requirements of national unity. The Malaysian nation is indeed unique in having rich and diverse cultural traditions and practices. We aspire to a society in which this diversity can be an asset and a source of strength."

4. *Foreign Languages*

Xenophobia is often the product of imperialist oppression. On the other hand, in any colonial regime, the so-called "running dogs" may have xenophilia which is equally futile in this situation. The correct policy is to make undergraduates, academic staff and nationally conscious members of the public realize the importance of learning one or more foreign languages for the sake of opening the way to knowledge without which material and intellectual progress would be impossible and without which the conduct of friendly relationships with people of other countries would be extremely difficult.

This mental preparation of the national outlook, a kind of linguistic Weltanschauung, is a key task for the leaders of a university. The ultra-nationalists must be convinced that the National Language is placed in a position where it is being learnt, used as a teaching medium as far as is possible without sacrificing standards and is a main means of communication in the university (i.e. correspondence, minutes, signboards, notices, etc.). The foreigners who cannot (and the nationals who will not) teach in the National Language but who are needed for their skills must feel that they are really wanted for what they have to offer and not wanted for their views on National Language policy formulation or implementation.

Constant vigilance is needed to ensure that the lastest effective innovations in language teaching are introduced through the Language Centre with perhaps guidance from the Faculty of Education and a central unit for educational technology, if there is one. The literature on university reforms in recent times seems to indicate that university teachers tend to be rather conservative and while they like to advocate revolutionary changes for others, they adopt a "not in my time " attitude where they themselves are concerned. Therefore they too have to be persuaded with carrot and stick to innovate in language teaching because this is one area in which the time margins are small and the emotional pressures are great.

At present, the most important foreign language in this region is English. Therefore, the methods of learning to read, write and speak English deserve study. Regional universities should make good use of the Regional English Language Centre (RELC) in Singapore, which has excellent facilities to offer universities though its current efforts are mainly directed towards primary and secondary levels of education.

In the not too distant future in Southeast Asia, Chinese and Japanese will become increasingly significant languages. At present, these languages are easily learnt by the 15 million persons of Chinese origin in Southeast Asia, which has an estimated total population of 230 millions. Because they have learnt the language at school or because they have experience of speaking it at home, of seeing films or TV, listening to the radio or reading magazines, they maintain some awareness of the Chinese language and Chinese writing. Because of the use of characters or kanji, Chinese students tend to learn Japanese easily although they may not have such good pronunciation. As a result, about 95 per cent of Malaysia's students in Japanese universities are of Chinese origin.

Universities will have to give greater attention to the teaching of these languages because in the near future they will be the languages of influential nations in the region. Knowledge will come to the region from these two countries both of which have made gigantic strides in economic development during the past two or three decades.

Then in Southeast Asia there is a great need for interchange between regional scholars including staff and graduate students. The learning of each others' languages such as Thai, Indonesian, Vietnamese or Tagalog will become of considerable significance as regionalism becomes more important. This is comparable with the growth of regionalism in Europe. It will expedite the realization of regional institutions that will reinforce the present activities of regional bodies such as ASA which existed some time ago and ASEAN which is the current regional political association of states. We should not forget to mention, at the university level, such regional bodies as the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL) and the Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development (RIHED). The Ministers of Education have the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO).

One day, this academical regionalism may culminate in the establishment of a University of Southeast Asia. It would be interesting to speculate on the impact of such a university, both on the formation of national identities and on the awareness of foreign languages for purposes of development and communication.

National identity will be easier to formulate if the creative intellectuals have opportunities to learn the languages of the great cultures that underlie national identity in such multi-cultural countries as Malaysia. How could one understand the great Javanese epics without knowing Kawi or classical Javanese? How could one study Islam without knowing classical Arabic? How could one understand the Theravada Buddhism of

Thailand without knowing Thai? These are language questions that universities are confronted with in the perennial search for national identity.

Conclusion

We have examined some ways by which the university can help to strengthen the sense of national unity through its language policies. While this paper is oriented towards universities in developing countries, it is less relevant to those regions where the existence of numerous tribal languages or the lack of widely accepted effective native languages make the recognition of National Language based on a native language rather difficult.

In the hope that logomachic disputes over such terms as, nation, culture, or national identity, may be minimized in favour of a constructive exchange of opinions and experiences between university leaders from differing parts of the world, a few terms have been sketched in to serve as a framework on which the real discussion can be spread out.

To this writer the real thing stems from a commitment on the part of the members of a university including its staff, students, administrators and lay-councillors or trustees, to contribute towards national development. In this instance the aspect of national development selected is the betterment of the awareness of national identity. The university's commitment is to perform its task in the way it has known best for over a thousand years—by transmitting, preserving and discovering knowledge. And, in this instance, by doing so in the field of language. To do this it must use language. By using the National Language the university discovers and develops the National Language.

This task was relatively easy for the older universities in their time because they could mature over a long period. In this modern age of "instant" things, time margins are precariously short. Therefore this paper is concluded.

Mr. JENS PINHOLT

Department of Ethnography

Aarhus Universitet

In this paper I intend to discuss the topics mentioned in the title, and aspects of their interrelations. I will do this partly by drawing attention to certain points of relevance in the specific historical development in Denmark—one country in the group generally labelled "industrialized", "rich" or "economically developed countries"—and partly by taking a broader view of the problems concerned, as they stand out in the world today as seen from an anthropologist's point of view. However, I have chosen to concentrate mainly on the Danish situation, keeping cross-cultural generalizations at a minimum. It is my hope rather that any of the points dealt with here, which are thought to be of relevance to the situation in Asian countries, shall be taken up for further discussion afterwards.

There should be not doubt whatsoever that the institution of the university and the problems concerning language and national identity all deserve a central place in the development planning in any country today, most important of course in those countries that have to fight problems of education and economic development in a culturally and linguistically plural situation.

Before going further it is necessary to state briefly how I see the position and rôle of the university in society, as this is indispensible information for critically evaluating the following. Until recently most Danes (university people included) entertained the idea that the university was more or less isolated from the hustle and bustle of society at large ; it seemed self-evident that the small group of learned men, whose job it was to think and work in a strictly objective way, could not and did not interfere with the social, economic and political realities of society.

A more common view taken today, and the one taken also in this paper, is that not only is a university an integrated part of society at large (whether its members realize this or not)—either by contributing to the stabilization of the existing structures and institutions in society or by furthering change—but to a very high degree a university can in itself be seen as a mirror image of the society which created it and which persistently acts on its structure and activities. Objectivity, which is of course a necessary base for all serious scientific work, now as ever, paradoxically involves that we as scientists have to accept this situation and make clear to ourselves and others now it influences our work.

This point being clear, we must, whether we are inside or outside the university, have a definite interest in asking two further questions: Which are the major tasks of the university in a present day society? And which strategies should be followed in coping with these tasks? Talking in a very general way I should like to state as my point of view: The university should contribute by its research activities, by teaching, and by the spreading and implementing of knowledge and ideas as much as possible towards the development of the material and spiritual welfare of all the members of the state society—ultimately of the world society—according to democratic principles, i.e. to the effect that all individuals without exception are given equal chances of making real their wishes and needs with due respect to the demands of the community.

However, the university with all its different activities cannot do the job on its own. Research and education is not magic which can make change by itself. What is needed is a carefully planned and closely coordinated effort incorporating many different sections all leading in the planned direction. Political changes and social and economic reforms must go hand-in-hand with efforts made by the whole educational system, to ensure that the desired changes materialize.

It seems important to remember differences between the two groups of countries in our modern world which we have been accustomed to label economically developed and underdeveloped. Differences, which should be kept in mind when one tries to compare universities and their position and rôle in wider cultural and social contexts. On the one side are highly industrialized, economically integrated societies, mature nation states, in which universities have developed over hundreds of years as indigenous institutions. On the other side are the economically less developed countries of the Third World, most of them in an early stage of nation building, with universities implanted from outside in relatively recent years; universities representing culturally foreign types of knowledge and ideas, which in some form or other must be spread and integrated in the indigenous social and cultural contexts.

But with these differences in mind let us take a glance at the historical and the contemporary Danish scene, confining ourselves to a limited number of issues relating to the 19th century and more recent years which are of crucial interest to our topic. To understand the treatment a few very general remarks on the main trends in Danish history might be of value:

The Danish people (today some 5 mil.), all speaking the same language, have been united in a monarchy for nearly 1000 years. Around 1800 A.D. there were still quite extensive areas beyond present-day Denmark, with groups of people speaking different languages, ruled by the Danish king —Norway, the Duchies of Slesvig and Holstein on the southern border, the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland far away in the northern Atlantic. Today only Greenland is left as part of the state society, and the Faroe Islands with home rule are only loosely attached. It would be correct to say that Denmark at that time was quite powerful politically—even if on a limited scale—in the international European setting.

18th century Danish society was a peasant society with more than 90% of the population living in small local village communities from where hardly any threads of communication led out to the wider national society. The peasant carried on the same way of life as his father, grandfather and great-grandfather before him, drudging on land which was owned by a few big landlords, and getting no formal schooling. In the capital of Copenhagen, and in the small provincial towns there was a small but growing number of artisans and merchants, many of whom had come in from the south and were German-speaking. The king and the tiny élite around him, numbering maybe 1 or 2% of the total population and consisting of the landowning nobility and the top layer of the church hierarchy, had absolute power in the country, this being the fundamental and effective drive behind national unity. There was a tremendous gulf between top and bottom in this society, and any sense on the peasant's side of patriotism or of belonging to the national society was expressed through loyalty towards the king and the state, certainly not through awareness of or pride in a common national language.

This general lack of awareness of language as a symbol of national identity comes out clearly if we take a closer look at the general language situation. In the Danish kingdom proper the vast majority of the people spoke dialects of the Danish language. But quite a number of groups speaking other languages were also ruled by the Danish king. These languages were Norwegian, German, Faroese, Icelandic, Greenlandic. However, nearly all people were illiterate. Literacy was largely restricted to the clergy, the nobility and the administrative élite. Copenhagen was the definite centre of the country. The king resided here with his court, many of the most important people in the country clustering around him. All important government and administration went out from here, and since the only university in the country had started here in 1479 A.D. there was a slowly growing educated élite.

Under these conditions a written Danish national standard language was slowly finding its way ahead in Copenhagen, but its development was considerably hindered because most members of the élite regarded Danish as an inferior language, a crude peasant's language not so suitable for communication among cultivated people, even though many of them could both speak and write it. Latin and German both had a dominant position each in its own area. In the university Latin was used in all matters, this language being the means of communication among academics all over Europe. However, from the very start the university had been serving the church, having as its primary object to maintain orthodoxy and keep down any sort of heresy. Even though other studies such as medicine, law and the growing natural sciences were represented at the university, theology had such a dominating position that most university teachers who started out being non-theologians ended up in theology.

In the élite outside academic circles, German was the most common language. The geographical position of Denmark as the Scandinavian outpost towards Germany in the South has always meant a heavy influx of German culture and language, and in the 18th century this German influence was at a peak in leading Danish circles. The kings and a very high proportion of the nobility, leading administrators and officers had come in from Germany. Many of them—even some of the kings and their most important ministers—did not speak Danish at all. Danish noblemen wanting to make a career in the administrative hierarchy usually studied for some time at French or German universities.

It is not necessary for our purpose to go any further in this description. The picture should already be clear by now: A small centrally situated power élite governed the vast majority of uneducated people according entirely to its own decisions in an administrative language which paid no attention whatsoever to locally spoken dialects or languages. This élite maintained a monopoly on artistic culture and knowledge, well guarded behind the protective languages of prestige and special lore. A university in this society only served the purpose of buttressing the existing social and cultural order as this was closely tied down to the furthering of the interests of the small minority in power.

The 19th century became the great period of turning-points for many different aspects of Danish society and cultural life. These turning-points radically changed the old society we have just looked at. The Danish language grows to become a powerful symbol of the feeling of common national identity among all people. The peasants' large, till then inarticulate, masses rise from dependence on the big landowners and deep tradition-boundedness to independent freehold, after which follows the great development in agriculture. And absolute monarchy gives way for a free democracy with participation of all population groups.

While in many other European countries development came about in a stormy way, it had in Denmark the quality of progressive reform, stimulated by national movements and fertile initiatives.

It would be a mistake to believe that all this development was a result of co-ordinated planning—it was far from it. There can be no doubt that a favourable correlation of a whole series of factors played an essential part in the course of development.

Firstly must be mentioned the rather out-of-the-way situation of the country in relation to the then focuses of European development. This generally meant a delay before social and cultural currents reached the relatively small Danish scene (towards 1800 A.D. Denmark had only a little more than 1 million inhabitants). This delay gave the leading circles time to act and make up for the most serious deficiences and problems which they could see had created troubles in other countries.

Thus it happened that far-sighted landowners, administrators and other influential men from the small élite—inspired by the ideas of the Enlightenment—began from the end of the 18th century to take certain initiatives. These led to the important reforms necessary to activate the peasantry towards a constructive participation in social life. In 1788 came the decree which emancipated the peasants from the big landowners and made them owner-occupiers. Along with this the authorities took the initiative of introducing compulsory education for all children between 7 and 14 years. Throughout a sequence of years schools were built in nearly all the villages. The already existing secondary schools in the towns, which had till then put heavy stress on the Latin language, had their curricula changed. The central point was that the whole country was now supplied with schools which clearly attached great importance to the Danish mother tongue. Standard Danish was thereby spread to the whole population.

Furthermore the authorities took the initiative of widely publishing instructive agricultural literature in Danish with advice and proposals for improvements, and a large number of supporting organizations for farmers were also established.

The traditional university slowly began being changed around the year 1800. From the growing middle class in the towns a much-needed new supply of students began coming to the university. The humanities flourished at the same time as civil servants of different kinds were being educated. The theological iron grip was slowly loosened. The Danish language pushed forward instead of Latin, but all this development was very slow, and the university world continued throughout the century to be above the practical problems connected with the progress of the peasants. On the other hand it became to a high degree the seat of the liberal and national currents which in the 1830s affected the middle classes and the academics. These were the currents which in the middle of the century enforced a free democracy in a bloodless manner.

The traditional loftiness of the university concerning problems connected with general education, the technical and agricultural development, the movements of the masses in the lowest layer of society, all this was contributing to the rise of other institutions which took care of research, implementation, and national revival in these fields. These institutions were among others the Technical University of Denmark, the Danish College of Engineering, the Royal Veterinary and Agricultural College in Copenhagen, and scattered all over the country training colleges for the education of primary school teachers, agricultural schools, and last, but not least, folk high schools. Whether primarily concerned with research or teaching, all these new institutions attached great importance to the use of the Danish language, which was thereby supplied with new vocabulary and was made the object of the wide and constant use necessary for its development and for its preserving of vitality and strength.

The folk high schools were voluntary schools for adolescents and came to play a decisive part for the growth of national awareness among the peasant youth. They started in the middle of the 19th century. They were built in different parts of the country with support from the local population and so had a close connexion with these. The aim of these schools was to awaken the peasants to active participation in social and political life after this had been made possible through the peasants' emancipation and the introduction of a free democracy. Through lectures and songs in the national language the Danish people's community in the present and the past was pointed out. A lot of songs were written and performed with enthusiasm—about the small but "beautiful Danish country", "the mother tongue" and historical events—pleasant as well as unfortunate ones. The folk high school did not deal with a vocational education; it was not an exam school. Nevertheless—or maybe exactly for that reason-it has had an enormous importance for the Danish peasant's development vocationally as well as spiritually. The reasons for this must first and foremost be sought in its power—through the use of the mother tongue—to stir a feeling of national identity and enthusiasm, and in its accompanying power to commit people to personal attitudes and action. It was simply a school which made the peasants think and feel in a new way. It went down to the bottom layer of society and lifted up, instead of just giving place for the particularly talented, the cultured and the rich.

It is probably significant that the enthusiasm and national community feeling which were important motive forces behind the inner development of 19th century Denmark, to a high degree are connected with external dangers and misfortunes. During the century the military force of the country was totally crushed through several wars; Norway (1814), Slesvig and Holstein (1864) had to be surrendered to foreign powers. The general feeling about these defeats was despair; the country had been reduced to a never-before experienced status of international unimportance. But at the same time the will to survive was aroused, and it became a common slogan that "what was lost outwards must be won inwards".

The principal outer enemy had been German Prussia. This contributed further to strengthen antagonism within Denmark towards the language and culture of the small domineering minority. In this as well as the previously mentioned state of affairs was felt the complicated interrelation of numerous factors (and undoubtedly still more factors could be mentioned here). However, out of the whole situation the importance of language and the feeling of national identity seem to stand out clearly in the course of development.

Just as apparent is the secluded rôle of the university. With its antiquated structure, its language character, and close connexion to a small élite, this institution was completely unqualified to play any prominent part in the vigorous processes of change.

I have here omitted to mention Danish industrialization and the subsequent growth of a working class, because this only began really gathering speed at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century—when the processes which interest us in this context were practically complete.

In this phase of Danish development importance has been attached to showing the growth of the national language and the sense of national identity. But how were things in the more or less remotely situated areas with different language minorities under Danish rule? These, too, were seized by that feeling of the importance of their own languages and cultural character which swept Denmark and the rest of Europe, but they were in a far more difficult position than the majority of Danish-speaking peasants.

Already in 1814 the Norwegians had escaped the political affiliations with Denmark. But centuries of Danish administration and liturgical and literary language had made fertile soil for a strong movement down to the present century which has fought for the creation of a specific Norwegian literary language on the basis of the spoken language in the rural areas, liberated from the dominance of Danish.

On the southern border the population in Slesvig mainly spoke Danish, and they spoke German in Holstein. The administration from the Danish state had for long been done in German without regard to local language. (There was a special German chancellery in Copenhagen during the time of absolute monarchy which took care of affairs of these areas). During the vigorous nationalist and liberal currents of the 1830s and '40s the absolute monarch was pressed by enthusiastic public feeling to introduce Danish administration in the parts of the Duchies where the everyday language was Danish. This started a long and bitter antagonism between Danish-minded and German-minded people, which did not stop until 1920 when the area was divided between the Danish and German states in such a way that the two language groups each went to its parent state. The remaining language minorities on each side of the border are today, through mutual agreements between Germany and Denmark, permitted to maintain their own language and culture, mainly by means of their own schools which take care of teaching the mother tongue.

The relatively small and isolated language groups of the North Atlantic have had more difficult conditions. With the strong underlining of common culture and language in Denmark and the growth of the national society towards a single culture there also followed a lesser understanding of the language problems of the small minorities. The right to cultivate the Danish language was received with enthusiasm by all Danish speakers in the 19th century and has since then been taken for granted. But on the whole these people failed to understand that the remote members of the Danish kingdom on the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland did not share this view of the Danish language. Danish continued to be all-dominating in administration and schools.

In Iceland an independence movement strongly linked with an Icelandic language movement led to liberation from Denmark, partial by 1918 and complete in 1944. Iceland, with a population of more than 200,000 today has the necessary background for building up an independent national society with its own language, liberated from Danish language dominance.

In the far smaller Faroese population (about 40,000) a similar movement in 1948 led to home-rule inside the Danish kingdom. Faroese is now the teaching language in all schools, but Danish of necessity still has an important place in teaching, academic education till now having had to take place in Denmark.

Greenland remains—until about 1950 consisting of a number of small Eskimo hunting societies which were nearly cut off from the surrounding world, but which from 1953 by a unilateral decision from Denmark was made a closely integrated part of the Danish kingdom. In the past 20 years Denmark has made big efforts in the economic and educational fields to further development which can bring Greenland into the modern world. To further development as much as possible the Danish state has appointed a very large number of vocationally qualified Danes in connexion with teaching, combating of disease, social services, and construction work, and free initiative in trade has been allowed to expand.

However, nearly all the specialists are without any knowledge of the Greenlandic language. A thorough Danish domination in nearly all areas of social and cultural life, together with a mixture of passivity and disillusion in many Greenlanders, are the temporary results of this massive assimilation policy. Simultaneously, however, a strong acknowledgement of Greenlandic identity is growing in the population, stimulated by the still rather small educated Greenlandic élite's demand for more Greenlanders' influence in the development of their own home.

With all due respect for the enormous Danish efforts in Greenland one must, as a social researcher in 1973, wonder at the amazingly small degree to which development policy there has benefited from the Danish experience of the last century. The relation between the use of the mother tongue, the sense of community and national identity and the consequent enthusiasm, all the things that lay behind the Danish peasants' progress, naturally cannot uncritically be said to apply to the Greenlandic or other situations, but the fundamental lesson which must apply to all development planning cannot be neglected: one can stimulate development from above, but final success depends on development growing from below with a basis in an awakening of people.

So far in my exposition, the university has been conspicuous by its absence. This is, as already mentioned, related to the unfitness of the university in past times to actively deal with research, planning, implementation, and stimulation concerning development of the society. Language and structural conditions prevented this, as we have seen. The university did not serve the broad population generally but only a negligibly small upper class. Its research and teaching were primarily directed towards retaining rather than changing the social structure.

But when I now briefly turn to the Danish situation today, the university will naturally occupy a central place in the picture. This is related to the fact that research and knowledge, which was previously the luxury of a few privileged people, today are behind most changes in our society. In modern Danish society we witness a development which with increasing speed brings about changes in our surroundings and makes new demands on our knowledge and expertise. But at the same time it becomes more difficult to sustain the necessary communication between different groups in the population.

The reason for this changed situation is not new. Through the gradual development of universities (in 1928 was founded Denmark's second university, in Aarhus) and other research institutions an important basis has been made for production of research which can contribute to changing our existence. This production phase in research continually demands much attention; research possibilities and—milieus—national as well as international, intra — as well as interdisciplinary, must be stimulated. But today it is also clear that a far higher priority to the consumption phase is more necessary than was thought in the past. It is a matter of the implementation of research, its background and results. Here I especially think of the spreading of an elementary understanding in the widest possible circles of the general principles and methods which are the basis for the research work which to such a high degree is contributing to form the society and the world around us.

These things are not gained by an extension of the university sector only. It is absolutely necessary to have a co-ordinated planning of the whole teaching system. Here appears one of the most serious problems which Denmark and many other old countries fight against just now—the tendency of the university to be isolated from the rest of the society, and the inconvenient splitting of the educational system into often casual categories due to the accidental play of historical development. These are problems which have been highly discussed in recent years in connexion with the planning of 4 new university centres in different parts of the country.

It is being planned that these university centres shall co-operate closely with already existing institutions in their area. Also they shall give high priority, in research as well as in teaching, to problems of special relevance and importance to the local region and its development within the national context.

The earlier described language development does not imply that all problems concerning language have been solved. The Danish language is spoken and written only by about 5 million people, and so it is of extreme importance to maintain an effective communication with the main scientific languages. A long time after the abolition of Latin as the university language—even down to the beginning of the 20th century—the University of Copenhagen suffered from poor international contact, because the important languages of international science had not yet been sufficiently integrated in the Danish educational system. But foreign languages—especially English, German and French and lately also Russian—have now for a long time had a prominent place in secondary education.

Ability to read at least two foreign languages is a general demand of all students at Danish universities, as most subjects must make extensive use of untranslated books. Also the international exchange of students, teachers and researchers, which in these years gets increasing importance, makes the command of foreign languages, to the widest possible extent, necessary for everybody in the tertiary sector of the educational system.

By way of introduction I called attention to my ideas about the task of a university which must, as a matter of principle, be the same in all modern societies. This is because research, and knowledge based on international communication and the implementation of these on a national level quite decisively have become the motive powers behind nearly all social development. But most developing countries today have naturally far bigger problems demanding solutions than for instance Denmark. Especially there are the problems in connexion with language and identity, which in Denmark to a wide extent found their solution in the last century outside the then existing university. Here the modern universities in the developing countries must play quite another active part in connexion with the exploration and solution of the problems.

Even if I want to be very cautious in drawing direct parallels from the Danish experience, I would like to, by way of conclusion, put forward some single important points which in my opinion must be included in thoughts about the way to go in the Third World.

Especially there is reason to warn against an uncritical taking over of the Western educational pattern including the inheritance left over in many countries from the time of colonization, in the form of a badly adjusted educational system. It is clear that the countries in the Third World must be interested in furthering technical and economic development as much as possible. But an educational system which contributes to such a development does not necessarily at the same time contribute to social and cultural improvements for all individuals and groups. Experience shows this for Denmark and other Western countries.

Further, co-ordination of the whole educational system and the fitting of this to a planned collective development policy must be given high priority, if the desired effects are to be reached. It is useless to aim strongly at an extension of tertiary education if at the same time the primary and secondary sectors are neglected. It will also be a mistake to attach weight to the extension of research on the production phase, if at the same time everything is not done to put this research to use. All possibilities must be employed in order to increase the mutual co-operation and the understanding between the university and the society it is a part of and works for.

As regards language problems, which are in many countries enormous, it will be very difficult to put forward simple instructions for their solution, but the following assumptions can reasonably be a part of a discussion: 1) Any language group ought to have the biggest possible support in keeping and developing its mother tongue. Experience seems to show that a good command of the mother tongue is an important background in the effective learning of other languages. And also, feelings of a common national identity in a linguistically plural society would seem to have the firmest base if all language groups are allowed to participate in the community as equal partners, each having its own culture and language respected in all possible ways. 2) The national language must at the same time be developed on all fronts, partly as a means to furthering the national community, partly as an expedient to promoting international communication. Bilingualism in all cases and trilingualism in many cases must be the goal—even if remote—one aims at.

Different problems must be considered when a national language is decided on. Naturally the chosen language must be politically neutral so that no group should feel disadvantaged compared to any other because of the choice. But it should not be forgotten that a national language besides contributing to the building of a nation set apart from the world at large, also should be an effective means of communicating with other groups at an international level, as well as making the individual feel responsible to the whole family of nations.

As the linguist, Basil Bernstein, has shown, language codes differ very much in their ways of acting on the speakers' way of thinking and thereby also on their social relations. In point of fact Bernstein is dealing with class society in a mono-language situation, but certainly such considerations must also be most relevant in a plural language situation. Some languages should therefore possibly not be chosen as national languages.

Finally, also economic costs in connexion with translation of books and other teaching material necessary should be taken in consideration. An ideal language policy demanding too heavy economic burdens for its implementation could easily turn out to be a failure.

It is in this connexion essential to underline the fact that there are many ways of symbolizing national identity and sense of community, but a common language—mind you, not a lifeless static one, but a language in continual use and change—seems to be a very important key to many of these symbols.

Discussion

Dr. Kasem then opened the discussion on the two papers.

Dr. FISCIAN described the contradictory pressures which were exerted on African universities. In the search for national authenticity, they were expected to revitalize indigenous languages, but at the same time they were required to use a major language of international communication which, very often, was also the language used by the government.

Professor UNGKU AZIZ pointed out that there was a difference between the conservation of indigenous languages—often very numerous and existing only in spoken form—and the development of a national language. Although it might be necessary to work hard to ensure the survival of the former, this in no way detracted from a nation's need of a common language, if necessary one of foreign origin.

Professor RYBNIKOV said that he could describe briefly the experience of his country with regard to policy in matters of nationality and language in the field of higher education. The Soviet Union was a vast country with a population comprising over a hundred nationalities. These enjoyed equal rights in all fields of life, including that of language. He described the organization of education using national languages as the media of instruction and explained the rôle of Russian in facilitating the development of mutual relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and in uniting them in the building of a progressive society. In the USSR very large sums were spent on education, care was taken always to respect national feelings and great patience and consistency marked the process of giving effect to policy decisions. Although the countries of the world were developing along different lines, the experience of the peoples of the Soviet Union, who had achieved so much in so a short period of time, appeared to merit careful attention.

Professor SINGH agreed with Professor Ungku Aziz that a common language was an important element of national cohesion. But what was to be done where one did not exist ? In any case, before substituting one language for another in higher education, the possible repercussions of this on the quality of teaching had to be clearly foreseen. India provided an instructive example of this. English had been introduced 125 years ago as the language of the universities. In 1947, however, following independence, a movement had grown up in favour of the adoption of Hindi and some universities had started to use it, at least partially, in their teaching. The results had been disappointing, for the change-over had been insufficiently prepared. Extensive use had had to be made of translations but, as was well known, translations were often unsatisfactory tools. Though a great deal of money had been spent, quality had suffered. Higher education and research had quite special requirements and not every language could immediately satisfy them.

The use of Hindi raised additional problems. India was a multilingual society and none of its languages had achieved sufficient influence to be accepted by all as a national one. Although it could be a unifying factor, language could also be disruptive. One of the reasons for the birth of Bangladesh had been the attempt to impose Urdu as the national language on Bengali-speaking East Pakistan. In India, the Constitution stated that Hindi was to become the national language, but a harsh application of this provision could lead to dangerous tensions. An attempt had been made to distinguish between three linguistic levels which ought to co-exist: the "library" language which would be English; the national language which would be Hindi; and finally the regional languages. But this did not provide a solution, for it remained to be decided at which levels each of these languages should be taught, by whom and by what methods.

Finally, even if a national language were adopted, there remained the problem of defining the place of foreign languages, or at least of one of them, in education.

It seemed a waste of time and energy to pay very great attention to the preservation and development of local dialects if they were not written and possessed no literature of their own.

Professor Ungku Aziz had mentioned borrowed words. Unless these were completely assimilated into the language. Dr. Singh felt that it was preferable to retain their original spelling, thus providing evidence of their origin and linking them with international usage.

Dr. Yip suggested that the use of national and foreign languages in higher education moved in a cycle. Thailand—which had always used Thai—and Indonesia—which had systematically replaced Dutch with Indonesian since independence—had now become aware of the need to intensify the teaching of English in order to provide their students with access to indispensible scientific literature.

Malaysia was still at the beginning of the cycle: emphasis was being placed on Malay and less importance attached to English. It was to be expected that this tendency would be reversed sometime in the future, unless the cycle was broken. Professor Ungku Aziz had stressed that the university must actively participate in the development of the national language. It should also stimulate the production of textbooks and other original scientific works in the national language. Translations almost invariably fell short of the originals and were often published only when these had become outdated. It was necessary, therefore, either to create an original scientific literature in the national language or to enable students to make direct use of foreign sources.

Dr. Seah said that in matters of language, universities had relatively little room for manœuvre and in developing a policy of their own could not depart too far from government policy or popular feeling. He wondered, moreover, whether there was necessarily a connexion between national identity and a common language. The example of Switzerland seemed to contradict this.

The situation in Singapore was particularly complicated since the island counted no less than four official languages: Malay, with the status of "national" language; English, with the status of "administrative" language; Chinese and Tamil. For several reasons, the University of Singapore had kept English as the medium of instruction. Firstly, certain concepts—and this was perhaps even the case with "national identity"—were most difficult to express in one or other of the Asian languages. Secondly, the rôle of Singapore in international life was such that English was indispensible. Finally, the adoption of any other language in the present climate would risk leading to serious tension between the communities and even to violence. However, primary and secondary education were to some extent bilingual. Despite its extensive usage of English, Singapore hoped to maintain and strengthen its cultural individuality.

Professor El Sherif felt that every country needed a national language so that all members of the community could communicate with one another. A common language had become an indispensible social institution and, as such, it was of interest not only to the university but also to the representative bodies of the whole nation and hence, the State. The special task of the university, however, was to study problems of the language and, if necessary, seek to develop its potential for expression and its structures. The university also had to train teachers of the national language and promote the publication of basic textbooks in that language.

In the Arab countries the choice of a national language did not present a problem, despite the existence of various dialects. Classical Arabic, the language of the Koran, was taught to all.

Although it was necessary to use the national language in primary and secondary education—for this was where the start had to be made—the matter of the medium of instruction in the university could be approached with more flexibility. It was, of course, desirable for the national language to be used as widely as possible, but it was not essential for it to be the only language: in a given university, one subject could perfectly well be taught in French, another in English and yet another in Arabic, if circumstances made this desirable.

Encik Ainuddin said that participants might like to know more about the historical and social context in which Malaysia had decided to adopt Malay as its national language. Perhaps Professor Ungku Aziz could come back to this later.

In any case, once a nation had decided on its language policy the university, as one of the institutions created to further national development, should assist in carrying it out. It was wrong to say that the adoption of a national language in a university necessarily impoverished the quality of teaching. The example of Japan, and also of Indonesia, proved the contrary. Nor was it true that translations were always bad and presented insurmountable problems.

As for borrowed words, keeping their original spelling might lead to such corruption of their pronunciation that they became unrecognizable. It might also be incompatible with the use of affixes which were very important in some languages.

The use of the national language by no means precluded the teaching of foreign languages, particularly English, the teaching of which started at the primary level in Malaysia. Some of Dr. Yip's fears might be unfounded. In the circumstances, Malaysia's choice seemed to be the right one and the fact that Singapore had chosen differently did not prove the contrary: the two countries were in different situations and were guided by different political doctrines.

Professor Zainal Abidin agreed that the language question could only be resolved in the context of particular nations. The languages spoken in a given country did not necessarily all have the same status: some might be indigenous—like Hindi or Tamil in India—and if this were so, they might be considered to have equal rights. Other languages might be imported, like Chinese and English in Malaysia, and these posed a different set of problems.

One of Malaysia's most important socio-political aims was to create a more balanced society and the generalized diffusion of the Malay language could contribute significantly to this. In purely economic terms, it could improve communication and hence promote trade. More important, it could favour the emergence of common attitudes. Language was not simply a vehicle which impassively transmitted knowledge. It induced and moulded thought and thus a society impregnated by a common language could enjoy greater homogeneity and greater originality than others.

More obviously still, a multiplicity of languages was a cause of misunderstanding and could lead to disaster. An example taken from the use of gestures—which were also a kind of language—would show this. In some societies, including Malaysia, respect was shown by covering the head; in others, by uncovering it. One could imagine the misunderstandings which would result from the movement of hats in a country where these two contradictory systems existed side by side !

It was therefore reasonable to suppose that a common language was indeed a condition of national identity. The example of Switzerland was not relevant, because the Swiss people had many other things in common—a common Christian heritage, European origins and culture. It was precisely a religious, ethnic and cultural community of this kind which did not exist in countries like Malaysia.

After all, most European countries had also felt the need, at some point in their history, to shake off Latin tutelage and bring their national language to the fore, even at the highest level of intellectual activity. It was quite likely that at the time, many people had predicted a collapse of intellectual life. It was wrong to think that a language, once given, was immutable. A language developed, was forced to develop, by the very process of use. In a sense, it generated its own development.

It seemed that translations would only be needed for a transitory period. The theses of students alone would provide an embryo of scientific literature in the national language. This did not mean that English would no longer be important, but it would be pernicious if it were to become a cult paralyzing efforts to develop any other language. The cycle described by Dr. Yip in relation to the use of English in Indonesia did not apply to Malaysia which had not had to go through the process of ridding itself of Dutch, of developing its national language and only then of encouraging the teaching of English.

Finally, it was true that the teaching of the national language should begin in the primary and secondary schools, but it was no doubt the responsibility of the university to draw up the curricula and prepare the textbooks needed for this.

Professor SANTOSO described the complex history of the emergence of the Indonesian national language. At the beginning of the century, some 200 dialects were spoken in the archipelago, but there was also a common language of communication. From 1908 onward a group of medical students worked to promote this language, "Bahasa Melayu". After various campaigns, the Dutch Government resigned itself to its introduction into secondary education. The universities, however, continued to teach in Dutch and to extend its use. But the social forces at work outside the universities proved stronger. The present national language. "Bahasa Indonesia", began to develop, and then the Japanese occupation swept the Dutch language away. With the declaration of independence, Bahasa Indonesia was proclaimed the national language. The universities adopted it and began to contribute to its development. At the same time, English was introduced as the first foreign language, in order to avoid scientific and cultural isolation. It was now taught from the secondary school onwards. However, the place given to the English language by no means meant that the country considered it had failed with its own language.

Bahasa Indonesia had been based on local languages and dialects but had also borrowed from two other sources: the languages of neighbouring countries—particularly Arabic and Sanskrit—and from Western languages. It was true that there had been difficulties in adapting it for scientific use, due in particular to the multiple and very different meanings of many words depending on their context. There had also been difficulties in the supply of books. But in general, the language had proved exceptionally vigorous. It would now be necessary to add another 10,000 new words to any dictionary published five years ago. Language development had been supported by the whole of society and various dialect groups had agreed to sacrifice some of their individuality in favour of the Indonesian national identity. A recent important development was the agreement of Indonesia and Malaysia to standardize spelling.

Professor **LEGGE** remarked that the area of discussion was one in which it was difficult to distinguish between cause and effect. Did a common language produce a feeling of national identity and lead policy in that direction, as Mr. Pinholt had implied ? Or did the unity of language result from a political decision taken after the constitution of the nation and in order to strengthen it, as Professor Ungku Aziz, had suggested ?

However this might be, language was an important factor in matters of national policy in a country like Malaysia which was indeed quite different from Switzerland. But although it was necessary to have a national language, did it follow that this had to be adopted at any price as the medium of instruction in higher education? A clear distinction could be made between the teaching medium and what might be termed the "access language" which enabled a country to remain in contact with international science and its development. One was, however, justified in asking whether from the moment that it was no longer used as a living language in teaching, the "access language" would not progressively weaken to the point at which it could no longer serve the purposes of communication and exchange of ideas. Was it certain that, in ten or twenty years, the Prime Minister of Malaysia would be able to open a seminar in excellent English ? If not, did this not mean that an element of communication would have been lost ?

Professor **HAMZAH SENDUT** thought not. The Prime Minister would speak in Malay, but he would have an interpreter as, for example, Mr. Chou

En-lai had had in this conversations with' President Nixon. In any case, it was impossible to deny the importance for every country of having a national language. Australia had chosen English, even if the choice had seemed self-evident. The choice might be less easy in other countries; but it was not less necessary. Once the choice had been made by the nation, the university had a threefold rôle:

a) to help to carry out the national language policy;

b) to contribute to the development of the national language itself;

c) to train people able to speak two languages and hence to communicate with the outside world (without itself being a bilingual institution).

The circumstances in which the universities had to fulfil these functions could, however, vary considerably. The Australian universities, for example, had not had much to do as far as *a*) and *b*) were concerned. But perhaps they still had quite a lot to do with regard to *c*). There was no question of having a universal formula. Variables such as student population structure and the proportion of foreigners in the teaching staff obviously had to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Keyes said that although Professor Ungku Aziz and Mr. Pinholt had used different approaches in their papers, these had been complementary and it was in fact the purpose of the seminar to bring together a variety of points of view.

One of the merits of Mr. Pinholt's paper was that he had put the subject in its historical perspective and shown the changes of rôle which could take place. A language which had at first played an emancipating rôle could later be used as an instrument of oppression. And since English had come into the discussion so often, it was perhaps worth noting that it too had been the language of a conquered people, though rather long ago. It had had to fight for its position against the language of the court which was French. Later, of course, it had been imposed on other conquered peoples. Language had been an active element in the emergence of European nations, but it had been no less important a factor in the more recent struggles of colonial peoples for independence.

Though Mr. Pinholt had shown that the rôle of the university in this domain had been of minor importance in Denmark, Professor Ungku Aziz believed it could be of decisive importance in Malaysia. There was no inescapable contradiction here, because the two countries had evolved through different historical processes. It was to be hoped that the more brutal forms of the age-old cycle—of peoples alternately conquering and being conquered—had now come to an end, or would only still be found in isolated cases. What was important for most countries now was the conscious and concerted development of their culture and economic life. And in this, universities could now play an important part.

The Chairman of the Session, Dr. Kasem regretted that there was no time to continue the discussion which was far from exhausted. Before closing the session, he gave the floor to the two main speakers.

Professor Ungku Aziz said that the discussion had illustrated the diversity of situations. It was striking to note that Indonesia, despite the multiplicity of its languages (several of which had their own literature), of its dialects, and despite also its geographical fragmentation into some 4,000 islands, had not experienced the same difficulties as India with regard to a national language.

It was therefore very difficult to generalize and in the case of Singapore, for example, it was quite possible that the decision in favour of English had been the right one. It would, however, have been interesting to hear something more of Nanyang University which used Chinese as its teaching medium. Was it an institution geared principally to the Chinese-speaking people of Singapore, or did it recruit from the whole of the region ?

However things might be in Singapore, Malaysia could scarcely have done other than choose Malay. For all sorts of historical reasons, it was doubtful whether Malaysia could have survived as a multilingual country and the economic disparities which caused a serious imbalance in national life could only be corrected if Malay, the language of the masses —the rural poor—were promoted to the rank of national language. In purely linguistic terms, Malay was an easy language to learn and had a remarkable aptitude for absorbing new elements. It should not be forgotten that for a long time it had been used as the lingua franca in the region, from China to the Persian Gulf, perhaps from the tenth century on.

With regard to the absorption of new elements, it was clearly a sign of a language's vitality if, instead of just borrowing words and leaving them unchanged to form unsightly protuberances, it absorbed and then assimilated them completely. There should be no hesitation in such circumstances in modifying the spelling or the pronunciation of foreign words to adapt them to the style and phonetic structure of the language. English itself had digested a large number of French words in this way.

The relations between language and national identity seemed to be dialectic in form. The two elements strengthened one another, although it was not possible to distinguish a simple causal relationship between them.

Translations had come in for criticism during the discussion, but here too it was unwise to make hasty generalizations. The Japanese in particular had made and continued to make extensive use of translations but their scientific and intellectual life did not seem to have suffered. What was remarkable in Japan was the speed with which translations followed the publication of the original works. There was no question of the obsolescence which had been referred to earlier.

A final argument in favour of the use of the national language in higher education was that experience had shown that students were able to assimilate material more effectively and more rapidly if it was presented in their own language, rather than in a foreign language, even one in which they were fluent. Between a man and his native tongue, there was a rapport and a psychological immediacy which were irreplaceable. This did not mean, of course, that it was pointless to teach students to use foreign language source material.

Mr. PINHOLT also drew attention to the dangers of generalization. The language question could not be separated from the individual history of a nation, but it could nevertheless be agreed that there was indeed a dialectical relationship between language and national identity. The relationship between the university and society was equally complex. The university was a part of society and it was inevitable that it should reflect it to some extent. From this it did not necessarily follow that it must not criticize or suggest reforms. In any case, society was not homogeneous and its various groups criticized one another. Criticism was thus a part of the reality which was reflected and expressed.

Among the different social groups, it was important to pay special attention to minorities—in particular to linguistic minorities—which always tended to be at a disadvantage. This raised the question of the medium of instruction. If, in a multilingual society, all education was given in one language, discrimination would almost inevitably result: there was then a strong temptation for students to be chosen on the basis of the ruling linguistic policy and minorities could become increasingly alienated.

The Chairman thanked the speakers and closed the session.

THE UNIVERSITY, ITS GRADUATES AND THE LABOUR MARKET

On the second day of the seminar the chair was taken by Professor Hassan el Sherif who introduced the theme briefly. He then invited Professor Singh to present his paper.

PROFESSOR H.L. SINGH
Department of History
Banaras Hindu University

I must confess at the outset that I have made no specialized study of the problems of higher education that face such a vast continent as Asia. The problems are so numerous and diverse in nature that even broad generalizations may have to be qualified. Asian countries differ widely in their political systems, economic and educational development. In view of wide differences in their levels of development, it is difficult to put them into convenient categories and make a comparative study of their systems of higher education. My observations on the subject, which are largely based on my Indian experiences, may have to be corrected or modified by participants who have studied in depth the problems lying within their area of interest. I would like to preface my study with certain general remarks.

First, many countries of Asia attained independence after the Second World War. During the colonial period they had a system of higher education which had a limited objective. The ruling power needed a small body of natives who knew its language and who could be employed in lower administrative and clerical jobs. Higher education was predominantly literary; scientific and technical education was neglected. The language of the ruling power, whose knowledge was necessary for employment even in lower positions, was the medium of instruction in the universities. Higher education under colonial rule produced a new middle-class élite which was largely unproductive. Macaulay, whose famous minute of 1835 laid down the policy of education in India, had hoped that English education would produce a "class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect". The legacies of foreign rule in the field of education, as in many other fields, still persist in our educational policies and programmes and may perhaps continue to influence them for years to come.

Secondly, the end of foreign rule created new employment opportunities: high-ranking positions in the army, civil services, business and the like, which had been held so far by foreigners, became accessible to qualified men of the country. For positions left by foreigners highly educated men and trained personnel were necessary. There was a pressing demand for the expansion of higher education, literary, scientific and technical. More students went abroad for higher studies. In response to the new demand the governments took a keen interest in the expansion of education at all levels. Since in the scale of priorities school education came first, it received naturally considerable attention. The expansion of secondary school education, especially when it was unplanned and did not mark a stage at which most school-leavers could get jobs, created pressures for the expansion of higher education. Economic considerations apart, in the post-war period there is a growing awareness of the fact that opportunity for higher education is a human right not to be denied to any person. Higher education, which in most Asian countries before the Second World War was limited to a small section of the population, has a much larger clientele not confined to any particular class. University enrolments have been further swelled by a long-neglected section of the population, namely, women. In most countries there has been a spectacular growth of female education at all levels.

Thirdly, in the post-war period there has been a tremendous growth in the population of Asian countries. School and college enrolments have registered a sharp increase. The underdeveloped countries of this continent are faced with the most difficult problem of providing adequate resources to meet the situation. While the need of primary education for all is obvious and of secondary education to a lesser extent cannot be questioned, one feels genuinely concerned over the uncontrolled expansion of university education. In the present state of their economy Asian countries can ill afford to have this luxury, and yet failing to provide the school-leavers with suitable jobs, they have followed a policy of drift. In the liberal arts, law and commerce admissions have been made on the "open-door" principle, leading to the overcrowding of institutions of higher learning. Higher education has become something like a substitute for employment. Asian countries which are engaged in the task of developing their economy need highly trained personnel. The demand for manpower will depend on the rate of economic growth, and the supply on the resources that a country can make available for scientific and technical education. Both these factors tend to limit enrolments in subjects like technology, medicine and science. There is, however, no such rationing of places in the liberal arts for which high admission qualifications are not required. In fact, most of those who fail to secure jobs or admission into professional courses find their way into arts, law and commerce.

Fourthly, the quality of education imparted in the universities in Asia is much below the standard. Ill-equipped institutions, low teacher-student ratio, unsatisfactory conditions of service and the defective examination system have contributed to make high education not high so much as further education. If university education does not insist on academic excellence, the money and energy spent on acquiring it are a huge waste. The fall in educational standards has reached a point in India that it has been remarked that university education is by and large serving a purpose which can even be served by a good school education. While the decline in academic standards has been mainly attributed to over-expansion unaccompanied by commensurate physical facilities, the effect of replacement of the foreign language by the regional language as the medium of instruction in the universities has not been adequately assessed. In India this has been done in many universities without preparation. Students pass out every year without familiarity with the standard literature in their subjects. Unless the language in which university teaching is imparted provides sufficient reading material of a high quality, its use as the medium of instruction will have a depressing effect on higher education.

Finally, Asian countries which had been under colonial rule are still in the grip of a cultural crisis. Many of these countries are proud of their cultural heritage which they want to preserve, but they are also conscious of the need to accept the challenge of Western industrialism. This is a difficult decision to make. Science and technology point the way to progress and no country, howsoever wedded to the past, can do without them. The degree of response to the demands of the new age will determine the pace of progress. Poverty inclines people to tradition; affluence to modernity. The conflict between tradition and modernity is a major problem confronting the Asian countries, and I have no doubt that university education of the right type holds the key to progress. Education is indeed power which can fulfil the highest aspirations of man. Most universities in Asia are not very old and they can without much difficulty adapt themselves to new conditions. They can play a useful rôle by giving an enlightened leadership to the community. They have to show how allegiance to traditional values can be reconciled with the needs of the modern industrial age.

Objectives of Universities

I don't think I can add anything new to what competent authorities on this subject have said. The Robbins Committee on Higher Education (1963) listed four broad objectives of higher education, namely, instruction in skills, the promotion of the general powers of the mind, the advancement of learning and the transmission of common culture and common standards of citizenship. According to the Indian Education Commission, the functions of the university are: To seek and cultivate new knowledge; to provide the right kind of leadership in all walks of life; to provide society with competent men and women trained in various skills, who will also be cultivated individuals imbued with a sense of social purpose; to strive to promote equality and social justice; and to foster in the teachers and students, and through them in society generally, the attitudes and values needed for developing the "good life" in individuals and society. Teaching and research are undoubtedly important objectives, but isolated from the social purpose which the university has to fulfil, they overlook the social aspect of higher education. This attitude is reflected in the Report of a German Commission on University Reform, published in 1949. The Report defines the function of a university as "being to serve man through teaching the truth which is reached by scientific study of the real world. The three most important words in this definition are man, research and teaching." The Report goes on to stress: "We dissociate ourselves from those conceptions which put, not man, but research in the foremost place. We believe that university activity is justified only in so far as it renders service to man. This service is not restricted to the student who is to be taught, but extends directly or indirectly to the whole people." We shall not make an attempt to determine the function of the university in the order of its importance, but the social purpose of the university has been generally recognized. The view that pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is the aim of the university has lost much of its appeal. As a large proportion of the expenditure is met from public funds, the university cannot divest itself of its obligation to society. We are inclined to the view that advanced knowledge informed by a spirit of service will do great good to society and without it it can do harm. We think both functions can go well together and one has not to be achieved at the expense of the other. It is academic excellence that distinguishes a university from other institutions and if it falls below a certain level it cannot justify its existence. Also the quality of citizenship that the university develops, like the quality of knowledge, must be of a high standard.

One feels greatly concerned over the fall in academic standards of Asian universities. This is the more distressing because the standards had not been very high before. One should have expected an improvement in quality after the achievement of independence. Formerly for many of the ills of universities the colonial powers were held responsible, but the post-independence period has not been marked by a qualitative change. Over-expansion achieved at the cost of quality has done great harm to the cause of higher education. In India, college education by and large does not differ much in content and technique from secondary school education. The degree-holder is not "initiated into a way of life". In most cases it is the old life with the only difference that it bears the stamp of a degree. The condition is not so bad in institutes of medicine and technology because they have limited places for which stiff entrance qualifications are laid down.

The utilitarian aspect of universities is obvious, but there are certain other benefits of higher education to which the cost—benefit formula cannot be safely applied. How far education adds to the quality of life cannot be measured in economic terms. "To attempt to understand the world", writes Lord Robbins, an economist of repute, "to contemplate and to analyse its values—these are activities which, even if they were never associated with practical advantage, still lend meaning and dignity to life on this planet". The mental and moral qualities which the university seeks to develop distinguishes higher from lower education. Even in an egalitarian society the intellectual élite—the product of university education—should be distinguishable from the rest of the community by his high level of intellectual and moral attainments.

The Universities

Broadly speaking, the organization of Asian universities follows the Western model, though there are wide differences in the quality of instruction imparted in colleges and universities from country to country and even in the institutions of the same country. Those universities and colleges which have resisted the pressure for unplanned expansion and have not diluted their admission requirements have been able to maintain academic standards, but their number is not large. As able students prefer to study science, medicine and technology, the clientele of the liberal arts, law and commerce generally consists of students of an inferior quality. Frequent student agitations have contributed further to bring down the standards. The demands of students' unions include among others the lowering of admission qualifications, the relaxation or even abolition of compulsory attendance and the dilution of the standards of examination. Interestingly enough, in these demands one can hardly find any constructive suggestions for improvement in academic standards. Closures of universities and colleges together with a large number of holidays have considerably reduced the days of teaching work in India. Vacations are by and large treated as holidays. The attachment to the family among students is so strong that residence in the campus or outside makes hardly any impact on their academic and social life. Library facilities are unsatisfactory and even where they exist not many make use of them. Students prefer to take down notes in the classroom and teachers are too willing to oblige them because dictation makes teaching a much less exacting task. Students have got so used to this method that departure from it is resisted. The technique of passing the examination has been so perfected that students can show good results at the expenditure of minimum time and energy. To meet the growing demand for higher education several universities in India have introduced correspondence courses and some even allow private candidates to appear in their examinations. Such systems make nonsense of the aims of university education, as mentioned above.

In the pre-war period university education was restricted to a prosperous section of the population. The more numerous unprivileged section was denied the opportunity for higher education and consequently for employment in higher positions of administration, business and industry. Asian countries are faced with the problem of equalizing educational opportunities, but the difficulty is that if admissions are given strictly on merit, students of the unprivileged class, who have no advantage of a good schooling and all the disadvantages of being born in poor, uneducated families, cannot compete successfully with those belonging to better-to-do families. As university education is extremely expensive and highly subsidized by the state, the scarce resources of the country should be judiciously utilized. In other words, places in Asian universities should be rationed and be given to those who are mentally and morally fit to receive higher education. This would, however, perpetuate the old system which has been heavily weighted in favour of the privileged. Considerations of social justice require that by a liberal scheme of scholarships, by extending better school facilities to the poorer section and by reservation of places, even if it infringes the principle of merit, students of the unprivileged class should get the benefits of higher education. Equity demands that the pecuniary benefits of state-subsidized university education should not be monopolized by a small section of the population. In India the backward classes are given some preference in admissions and employment. It is worth noting that although the enrolment of students from rural areas and poorer families is increasing, higher education, especially in technology, medicine and business, is mainly confined to the relatively prosperous section of society; in higher technology students are drawn predominantly from the urban sector.

In any discussion of university education the problem of student unrest finds an important place. The widespread student trouble, which has seriously disturbed the campus life in many countries, is ascribed to a variety of causes, such as, frustration among students because of prospects of unemployment, defective processes of decision-making in which students have little or no share, the unhappy home environment, the politicization of students who are used by unscrupulous politicians for their ends, the growing awareness on the part of students of their strength, and the generation gap that is said to divide students from others in the seat of authority. In the recent past Indian universities have been rocked by student agitation leading to frequent closures. Student activists often resort to violence to get their demands accepted; the university authorities, finding the situation out of control, call in the police. The use of police force to maintain law and order in the university campus is clear evidence of the failure of civilized methods in dealing with the most enlightened section of the community. The success of a vice-chancellor in an Indian university is judged mainly by the measure of success he achieves in maintaining discipline. Campus life has become so disturbed that many vice-chancellors do not complete their full term and resign in disgust. In quite a few universities the post of vice-chancellor has remained unfilled for a long time. In fact eminent educationists seem most unwilling to accept the vice-chancellorship of even prestigious universities.

The most pressing demand of students concerns their right to a share in decision-making. They complain that matters which affect them vitally are decided by university bodies with which they are not associated. The solution to the problem is being sought in providing for student participation in decision-making processes. In the new Aligarh Muslim University Statutes (1972) the students have been given representation in the University Court. There is also a provision for a predominantly elected Students' Council having power to make recommendations to appropriate university bodies on matters concerning courses, the pattern of instruction, discipline, sports, the management of hostels, social work, health, student homes, etc. Student participation, it is argued, will make students more responsible and less destructive in their approach to university affairs. However, the change involves risks also. The danger of politics entering the portals of the university in a big way cannot be ruled out. Politics is pursuit of power and when it holds out the prospect of tangible gains, it is likely to make its appearance on the campus in an ugly form. In view of the strong political alignments of student leaders some such development seems unavoidable. It is likely that more universities will follow the Aligarh model. Needless to say that after having taken a step in the direction of student participation the universities cannot stop halfway. The confrontation of students is generally with the "establishment". How this is to be resolved calls for a radical change in the relationships at various levels in the university.

In a democratic country the importance of university autonomy can hardly be over-emphasized. The quality of leadership and the ability to make an intelligent choice among several alternatives depend to a considerable extent on the quality of university education. Autonomy has to be therefore jealously guarded and the university insulated from political pressures. In its academic programme, i.e., the drawing up of the courses of study, the method of teaching, the evaluation of students' performance and research there should be no outside interference. Major policy-decisions on national level should be taken in consultation with the academic community. Autonomy does not mean only freedom from state interference, it also implies that the educated community functions in a responsible and democratic manner. This is not what it should be. The Indian experience in this respect is far from encouraging. The democracy of teachers produced the teacher-politician, to eliminate whom the universities have replaced election by rotation. The teachers' representatives on various academic bodies are selected not by free and intelligent choice but they happen to be there by chance.

I am sceptical about the propriety of teachers adopting the method of factory workers in support of their demands for enhancement of salary and improvement in the conditions of service. I hope they are equally concerned to improve the quality of academic life.

In India some concern has been expressed over the growing interference of the government in university matters. There are two main reasons for this: first, as the universities are largely financed from public funds, the government claims that it has a right to see how the money is spent; and, secondly, frequent student agitations have made the universities seek government help for restoring law and order. When there are such troubles, the opposition in the State legislature or in Parliament misses no opportunity to criticize the university and the government comes to its rescue. It seems that Indian universities have to learn to live with some measure of interference by the government, which can be reduced to a minimum if the academic community sets its house in order. I don't think that university autonomy has been affected because the government exercises some power in the appointment of the vice-chancellor from a panel of names and in the nomination of some members on the Executive Council and the Court.

I have an impression that the universities in many Asian countries have not yet evolved an ethos. They have not developed healthy traditions which can resist deforming pressures. Academic pursuits do not seem to be the exclusive activity with most intellectuals. Teaching work is not regarded as something very different from other kinds of activity. Corruption and malpractices in matters of appointment and promotion have led teachers to adopt undignified methods for personal ends. The place of the teacher in the university is pivotal and he must be sufficiently awake to his responsibilities.

The Labour Market

We shall not enter into a discussion of the desirability of higher education for its own sake. It is undeniable that it develops mental and moral qualities which raise the cultural level of a country, and it also contributes to the social good. But the expenditure of the scarce resources of a country on higher education cannot be justified only on the ground of the intrinsic value of higher education. Nearly all those who receive education in the universities want jobs suited to their qualifications; the degree is regarded as a passport to employment. The growing incidence of graduate unemployment in underdeveloped countries creates a serious social problem which no government can view without concern. Graduate unemployment has been rare in developed countries after the Second World War, but it is serious in underdeveloped countries. The main cause is the slow rate of economic growth in these countries and the excessive supply of manpower which has outpaced the demand. In view of the uncertainty of economic growth manpower forecasts prove unreliable, resulting in unemployment. For instance, in 1966 the Indian Education Commission urged the need for more engineering graduates, but a year later and subsequently thousands of graduates remained without jobs. Every year there is a considerable addition to the labour force; a sizable proportion has to wait for jobs and those who can wait longer succeed in getting better jobs. Those who are not in a position to wait longer because of financial constraints and accept low-paid jobs begin their life with the disadvantage attending a bad start in life. They often fail to secure well-paid jobs. In subjects like the liberal arts, law and commerce there is less job satisfaction than in medicine, technology and other specialized subjects. A large number of graduates in these subjects are employed in clerical and teaching jobs. The over-expansion of literary education has increased the supply of graduates, who, failing to get jobs suited to their qualifications, accept jobs for which lower academic qualifications are required. This has resulted in the upgrading of occupations in terms of education*. By filling posts by overqualified men the employer runs the risk of creating discontent among the employees and increases the demand for higher education by deflating the job utility of the lower stages of education.

The expansion of higher education brings on to the labour market every year a large number of qualified men whose absorption into the economy depends on its growth. In subjects in which the supply of graduates is controlled by such limiting factors as the high cost of education, rationed places in universities and the needs of the economy, there is less unemployment, though overestimates of the required manpower, as we have noted in the case of engineering graduates in India, may reduce the demand, resulting in unemployment or underemployment. A faulty distribution of skilled personnel may also lead to artificial scarcity. For instance, the distribution of medical doctors in India is so uneven that whereas in rural areas there is one doctor for 20,000 persons, urban areas have one doctor for 1,400. The reluctance of doctors to move into rural areas will make medical service scarce even though the overall supply position may not be so bad. Since medical education is highly expensive and the returns on investment are attractive, some compulsion on the part of the State to make medical service available on a rational basis will be fully justified. In other words, the equitable distribution of a limited stock will bring more people within its range of service than a larger supply, if the distribution is faulty. It is interesting to note that in India which has a predominantly rural population, graduates in highly specialized subjects are largely drawn from a prosperous urban sector of society.

As said already, the over-expansion of university education has created a surplus in the labour market, leading to unemployment or underemployment. Forced by circumstances, many graduates accept low-paid jobs for which lower qualifications are required. A large number of them no doubt have to wait but it seems that the incidence of permanent unemployment is not large, which chiefly accounts for the rush to universities and colleges. The duration of the waiting period differs from subject to subject. Subjects in which the output of graduates is restricted offer better employment opportunities. In India, as perhaps elsewhere also, examination results are an important determinant in securing employment. Graduates with a first class are preferred to those with a second. A third class graduate, unless he is resourceful, suffers from a great handicap in securing a job. Prospects of employment improve with the level of the degree one holds. Ph.D.s. are less unemployed than M.A.s and M.A.s less than B.A.s. The income level is also to a considerable extent related to the degree. Since there is more and better employment at the higher levels of education, there has been a great rush to universities during the last two decades. In India, although the government is the main employer inasmuch as about 70 per cent of employment is in the public sector, it has not been able to resist the demand for expansion of higher education. In spite of the fact that the Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) had emphasized the need for the "consolidation and improvement of higher education through the strengthening of staff and library and laboratory facilities", uncontrolled expansion at the annual rate of about 13 per cent is going on. Since 88 per cent of university students are imparted instruction in colleges, most of which are private, the government finds itself under strong political pressure to concede the demand for opening new private colleges. Private agencies are little interested in academic excellence; all that they want are power, patronage and influence. Students receiving education in these colleges are interested in degrees which backed by influence help them in securing jobs. When the stock of graduates in arts, law and commerce is so large, the rôle of influence in employment can hardly be over-emphasized. According to a sample survey of graduates in arts, science and commerce from the colleges of Bulsar in South Gujarat, 80 per cent of the employed admitted that they had some influence in securing jobs. Degrees are so much in demand because they are distinguishing marks of educational attainments, and yet unaccompanied by influence they have a limited value for employment purposes. Another reason which creates the demand for a university degree is that it raises the social standing of the person.

---

* The subject of educational employment has been ably discussed by Blaug, Layard and Woodhall in *The Causes of Graduate Unemployment in India*, London, 1969, and by Mark Blaug in *An Introduction to the Economics of Education*, London, 1970. For a great deal omy information on the labour market in India I have relied on *The Causes of Graduate Unemf ployment*. I am indebted to these writers.

The growing number of women job-seekers has put the graduate labour market under further strain. Studies have revealed that a very high proportion of women graduates seek jobs and the incidence of unemployment among them is pretty high. With less job options open to them, women are concentrated in limited occupations. Further, they seek jobs in cities, which restricts the geographical mobility of the employed. Concentration of women in selected jobs and lack of mobility increase the pressure on an already tight labour market. The university degree is desired not only to improve the marriage prospect but also to enable educated women to earn. Many women wish to have economic independence or desire to supplement the family income. Some like to have a part-time job, which provides them with the needed relief from household chores. Even in a country like India where marriage is the principal career for most women, career aspirations are increasing. Prosperous husbands also like that the investment made in their wives' education should bring returns. Higher education is no doubt changing the traditional rôle of women. To maintain decent living standards, the earnings of the husband need to be supplemented by the wife's income. Whether the economic gain from the woman's employment offsets the loss suffered by the family and children resulting from her withdrawal from home is difficult to assess. Those who believe that the woman's place is in the home and that she should devote her full time to the care of the family and the training of her children may not be impressed by the career aspirations of women. They argue that the earlier education of the child under his mother contributes a great deal to his future academic and economic success. What we have tried to indicate is that more women are taking a university degree and are joining the labour market, subjecting it to further pressure.

Economists regard education as investment in human capital measurable in quantitative terms. Indeed, no country can continue to invest its resources in higher education unless the rate of returns is impressive. Economic analysis helps the planners to put the resources of the country to the best use. However, it has been rightly remarked that "educational policy has to be concerned with more than the balance struck between these economic inputs and outputs". There are considerable risks involved in investment in higher education. First, those who acquire a university education may not possess the requisite abilities to benefit from it; and, secondly, higher education may not provide them with better employment opportunities. The incidence of unemployment among graduates including professionally qualified men, besides creating a social problem, is a considerable economic waste. Educational planning has therefore to be geared to the needs of the economy. In spite of the shortcomings of manpower forecasting, economic analysis helps much in the proper allocation of resources. In India the supply of graduates far exceeds the demand, which has created a serious unemployment problem. On the position of graduate and postgraduate job-seekers in India the *Employment Review* says:

> The increase of over one lakh* amongst graduate and postgraduate work-seekers on the Live Register of Employment Exchanges is an indicator of pressure on the already somewhat tight labour market. Taking all the faculties together, it will be seen that the rate of increases in 1970-71 both amongst men and women were nearly double that of the previous year—the rates being even higher in the case of male ordinary graduates. Some further disconcerning trends... are the sharp increases in the number of job-seekers among science and commerce graduates (both men and women) and women postgraduates in both arts and in science subjects.

The causes of graduate unemployment in India lie in the defective system of school education, which is not job-oriented, the uncontrolled expansion of university education, the overestimation of manpower requirements and the slow rate of economic growth. Gunnar Myrdal suggests that the unwillingness of educated Indians to accept blue-collar jobs, a view with which Mark Blaug and his colleagues do not agree, is the cause of unemployment. If in spite of unemployment there is a demand for higher education, the reason, in their opinion, is that "additional education right up to the degree level still remains a profitable investment for the average Indian parent". Without going into the merit of this argument we are inclined to believe that the high-school leaver in India, failing to get a job, spends a number of years in the college or university, after which he accepts a low-paid job for which lower educational qualifications are required. The years spent in the college do not bring commensurate reward to a sizable proportion of them, but if they had discontinued their education, they would have remained idle for a long period.

---

* = 100,000.

I have dealt in brief with certain general problems of higher education, with special reference to India. Some of my observations, I hope, are also relevant to other Asian countries. The developing or underdeveloped countries of Asia have to make the best use of their scarce resources. Uncontrolled expansion will result in the deterioration of academic standards, unemployment and underemployment, student unrest, political instability and a waste of national resources. Selective admissions, the accent on quality in teaching and research, generous financial assistance to those who are fit to receive a higher education, the placement of university graduates on merit, and a well-conceived educational policy adopted by the state will remove many of the ills from which the universities in Asia are suffering.

Discussion

The Chairman of the session, Professor El Sherif thanked the speaker and, in opening the discussion, said that the needs of the labour market could be viewed not only in national but also in regional terms. Egypt, for example, trained high-level manpower for all the Arab countries. Such an approach might also be possible in South East Asia.

Dr. YIP felt that there was a growing trend in South East Asia which might in the long run lead to problems similar to those which India was experiencing. The right to education was more and more coming to imply a right to higher education. This had led to the creation in Thailand of an "open university" which had doubled the total number of students at one fell swoop. In Indonesia, a very large number of universities had been set up, and a similar but less marked tendency was to be seen in Malaysia. There was consequently a risk of graduate unemployment or underemployment in the near future. There were several reasons for this. First, although governments had made financial provision for education, there was a lack of adequate co-ordination between the development of higher education and economic planning. Second, economic planning itself often proved disappointing. Results frequently fell short of objectives and, in any case, it was still impossible to regard projections of high-level manpower needs as being more than rather crude approximations. Third, as had been pointed out, strong social pressures were acting in favour of the expansion of higher education, which had, moreover, been developing in an unbalanced fashion. With the possible exception of Singapore, there were too many students in arts and social sciences, and not enough in science and technology. Finally, sufficient attention had not been paid to needs for middle-level manpower, although Indonesia was creating a system of two-year colleges to provide training at this level. Any attempt to improve this situation would raise the question of university autonomy (which was inevitably limited by the existence of national plans), and involve making the difficult choice between selection and mass education.

Dr. SEAH believed that no one need be ashamed of élitism in higher education, particularly in the developing countries where it was essential to make the most of limited resources. In this connexion, it was desirable for universities to be state-financed in so far as this was possible—those which were dependent on tuition fees were naturally likely to be less demanding in their selection of students. If the consequence was greater financial control by the state, such an arrangement might not necessarily be prejudicial to the functioning of the university if there was recognition by both parties that the university's rôles were much wider in scope and that it was not merely an agency of the government or the state.

However, if higher education were to be restricted to an élite, it would of course be necessary to provide other opportunities for those who did not benefit from it. The "underprivileged groups" to which Professor Singh had referred, could not be dealt with merely by passing a law obliging the universities to reserve a fixed percentage of places for them. They first had to be provided with good primary and secondary education: the school years were of decisive importance for social advancement.

The disappointing results of planning in India should not be allowed to discredit all projections of manpower needs: in the absence of accurate figures, they could at least suggest orders of magnitude which could constitute useful points of reference for the universities. In Singapore, plans for industrialization had led to concentration on technical education, and there was no evidence of graduate unemployment.

Finally, the socializing effect of the university on the individual should not be exaggerated. Studies tended to show that the university did little to modify attitudes and values acquired in family life and at school.

Professor RYBNIKOV, quoting experience in the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries, emphasized that it was essential, in the interests of the harmonious development of society, to plan the training of highly qualified specialists within the system of higher education. Higher education in the Soviet Union was provided free of charge and academic standards were high. There was no unemployment. Professor Rybnikov then made a special reference to the work of the Preparatory Faculties in which children of workers and peasants studied; this was one of the ways of raising the level of social justice. Finally, he spoke of student participation in university governance and of student self-government.

M. RAJA ROY SINGH pointed out that although graduate unemployment was certainly undesirable, its existence might at least oblige universities and governments to re-examine some of their preconceptions and objectives. It should not be thought, however, that graduate unemployment was an isolated phenomenon. It formed part of a more general problem of underemployment which also affected many school-leavers. Only an overall economic policy could provide a solution. Furthermore, although university education in Asia was still the privilege of a very small percentage of the corresponding age group (1% to 6% depending on the country), graduate unemployment could also be found in countries with the lowest percentage (in Sri Lanka, for instance, with only 1%). But, even in Asia, university education was expanding, and the trend, as in the rest of the world, was toward a process of inflation. The continuing increase in the number of graduates resulted in a diminution in the value of a degree which was now coming to be required for quite ordinary occupations. None of this was very surprising.

Higher education in Asia was not sufficiently diversified. In a number of developed countries, the United States and Japan for example, the non-university sector of higher education was growing more quickly than the university sector. In most Asian countries, however, the major effort was concentrated on the university sector. The excessive rigidity of the system, moreover, did not encourage mobility. The remarkable growth of the furniture industry in Italy was attributable to a number of architects who, failing to find employment, had applied their training in this new field. After the 1952 recession in Japan, many research workers previously employed by big industrial concerns turned to smaller companies, and by giving them a fresh impetus, enabled them to contribute significantly to the economic development of the country. Changes of this kind, with all that they implied in terms of imagination and determination, did not occur in South East Asia or India. Why, for example, did these countries not employ their surplus engineers in secondary education, where they could provide a new impetus ?

The fact of the matter was that the universities in the region were still too hypnotized by the foreign models they had inherited. They had not been capable of innovating in the light of the needs of society and of their own students. An Asian equivalent of the Land Grant College had not yet been conceived, still less been brought into existence. Excessive specialization was rife everywhere, as though the only goal in education was research. But did Asian countries at the present time really need prestige physics or ultra-specialization in medicine ?

Professor Santoso said that in Indonesia higher education had expanded very rapidly after independence. Its development had not been related to the needs of the economy, and had led to considerable graduate unemployment. The government had now taken a series of measures to absorb the unemployed. The first was to encourage the formation of teams of volunteers for work in rural areas. Many of these graduates remained in the field after completing their first mission, and this helped to reduce the number of unemployed. The second was to establish centres for retraining unemployed graduates. The third was to give university courses a broader and more polyvalent content; this avoided rigid specialization, and thus contributed to greater professional mobility.

The long-term programme of the government and its planning offices involved a reorganization of the educational system on the basis of a more systematic analysis of the needs for high-level manpower and of the types of qualification required for each profession. It no longer appeared possible to allow each individual complete freedom in the choice of his studies and profession. At the very least, he should be provided with information so that he could be aware of the realities of the situation when making his decisions. In Indonesia, efforts were being made along these lines and the authorities were compiling an employment directory.

University entrance examinations themselves provided some measure of selection and special scholarships were awarded for study in fields which attracted few students, particularly mathematics.

Professor Zainal Abidin remarked that national and university planning need not necessarily be in conflict. Ways could be found to harmonize them.

There was no serious graduate unemployment problem in Malaysia at present because there was no real shortage of jobs. Difficulties could arise because many graduates did not want to work in rural areas where employment was available. There was a shortage of teachers in the educational system, and there seemed to be no reason why university graduates should not find employment for their knowledge and talents in secondary education.

A lack of balance still persisted in the humanities where proportionately the Malays were more strongly represented than the other ethnic groups. But this should not be taken as evidence of a deliberate choice, even less of the Malay's inaptitude for science. It was much more a consequence of the colonial educational system which had concentrated the schools with well-equipped science departments in the large urban areas where Malays were in a minority. They were thus under-represented in the university and particularly so in the sciences.

Such a situation revealed the dangers of a meritocracy which based university admission exclusively on scholastic achievements as measured at a given moment in life. Such a system could be defended in a truly egalitarian society, but elsewhere it might lead to the exclusion of certain groups, particularly those in rural areas. Compensatory measures were therefore necessary. The adoption of Malay as a teaching language was one of these. Despite what had been said, this had not led to a disastrous neglect of English. It was still taught from the first year of primary school and consequently students were generally well able to read English.

Standards were important but they should not be allowed to become a fetish or an excuse for opposing adaptation to real needs. Quality could be achieved at many different levels and the rapidly trained "barefoot doctors" of China rendered excellent services in the context of their own society. Nor was it true that increased student participation in university affairs necessarily led to a lowering of standards. To believe this was to show an unjustified lack of confidence in them. Students had created the Malay Language Society which deserved most of the credit for the agreement to standardize Malaysian and Indonesian spelling.

Finally, it was not true that students were impervious to the values which the university sought to transmit, or that their attitudes were fixed even before they entered it. The fact that some basic traits of their characters had already been formed certainly did not make them unreceptive to new values.

Dr. KASEM spoke of his countrymen's love of diplomas. The traditional universities were unable to provide places for all who wished to study and the establishment of the Thai Open University had reduced the pressure on them. The failure and drop-out rates at the Open University were quite high and its existence did not seem to have had very much effect on the labour market. At present there was no serious problem of graduate unemployment. Difficulties did, however, arise because the prestige traditionally attached to service with the Crown encouraged too many people to seek employment in the public sector. Some engineers had encountered minor difficulties, but these could be overcome by good economic planning. Social science graduates usually had to wait longer than others before finding employment. The rapid increase in the number of children entering secondary education made it difficult to predict the evolution of the situation—although the rate of increase might be slowed down by family planning.

There was, however, a shortage of doctors, particularly in rural areas where few wished to practise. Some preferred to emigrate to the United States or other countries, and there was indeed a brain drain. A partial remedy would be to require all medical graduates to work for three years in the more remote parts of the country.

The teaching of English in Thailand only began in secondary school and as a rule the results were not very satisfactory.

Professor **Hamzah** said that a possible explanation of the trend toward the devaluation of academic qualifications was that too many universities or "multiversities" were trying to do more or less the same thing and were thus competing with one another. A better division of responsibilities and a real attempt by universities to complement each other would help to check this.

Universities should make a much greater effort to provide retraining courses for graduates who had been ill-advised in their choice or field of study, for example, to enable the surplus of arts graduates to make a fresh start. In this connexion, employment was far too often thought of only in terms of salaried employment. Why not train more people for independent self-employment in commerce and industry? Loans to enable them to set themselves up could be provided, where necessary, by special investment bodies.

Finally, it was dangerous to be too abstract. To speak of "standards in general"was like speaking of "man in general". In reality, there were particular men, the Malays, for example, and standards could only be defined in terms of the potentialities of particular societies.

Dr. **Fiscian** questioned the feasibility of a regional approach to employment problems. It might seem more rational in theory, but in some countries the presence of foreign labour could lead to political and social friction.

Encik **Ainuddin** rejected the suggestion that there had been a general drop in the standards of higher education in Asia. The case of Japan gave the lie to this assertion, as did Malaysia where the universities had been known to reject students who had subsequently been accepted by universities in the United Kingdom. In Indonesia, standards undoubtedly varied but the strong universities were making efforts to help the weaker institutions, and this was an example which could be followed elsewhere.

It was doubtful whether student participation in matters concerned with curricula and teaching methods would help to raise standards. The causes of the student troubles which had broken out recently in many countries in fact lay outside the university and should be sought in the student's home background. The re-establishment of firm and stable family relationships would probably constitute the most effective antidote.

The preparatory faculties set up in the Soviet Union seemed an excellent method of providing redress for students from under-privileged backgrounds. The National Institute of Technology of Malaysia had carried out experiments of a similar kind. In medicine and engineering the policy of Malaysia was also similar to that of the Soviet Union, and graduates were required to work in the public sector for a number of years after qualifying.

Regional solutions to the problem of graduate unemployment presupposed a minimum degree of uniformity between the educational standards of the countries concerned, but this did not always exist.

Dr. Goheen warned against academic arrogance. There was nothing in a university education which made one man better than his neighbour or distinguished him in any fundamental way. Academic snobbism had many pernicious consequences. One was to question the value of diversity as it existed, for example, in the United States, and to bring pressure to bear on all institutions of higher education to conform to a single model, the university. Yet, to propose only one type of institution in response to the profusion of aptitudes and of needs would merely weaken society and make it less democratic.

Society was also weakened by the refusal to allow students to play an active rôle. Circumstances varied greatly from one part of the world to another, and the experience of the United States was not applicable in all countries. But it was not possible to maintain as a general principle that student participation led to the paralysis of the university and of society. On the contrary, it could provide both with a new and innovatory impetus. Many universities in the United States now accepted participation, and the results were encouraging. It was difficult to see anything wrong in students being concerned about their courses and studies, or even about the quality of their teachers. Though they lacked the competence to participate in the making of academic appointments, this did not apply to the appraisal of the teacher once he had been appointed. Some universities encouraged them to do this.

The restlessness of the students had in many respects been very healthy. It had obliged the universities, too long obsessed with problems of scientific, technological and economic development, to enquire once again into meanings and values. This was an area in which research was now being developed actively, often along interdisciplinary lines, and young members of academic staff were providing valuable stimulus.

Professor Legge agreed that possession of a degree did not confer membership of any particular class. It should, however, be a sign of a certain intellectual quality. "Excellence" remained very important and should be preserved by the university. Were not those who were ready to sacrifice it to the "needs of society" in fact begging the question? Who was to define the needs of society? Might excellence not be one of them?

Professor Ungku Aziz said that some universities had set up appointments services for their graduates, and that his own University was intending to do this, although there was no graduate unemployment in Malaysia at present. Such practical services were far more useful than manpower projections, which were about as accurate as astrology, except in wholly planned Socialist economies. In the market economies so many variables were at work that it was not possible to provide even a minimum scientific basis for forecasts of needs. Moreover, the concept of supply and demand was often too rigid. The usual pattern of thought was to express the demand of society in terms of its need for graduates and to state that it was the responsibility of the university to provide the corresponding supply. It was often forgotten that supply was an active element which could create its own demand. Mr. Raja Roy Singh had given examples of graduates who had created a demand for their services in sectors in which they had found a development potential, despite the fact that their own training had prepared them for different occupations. Some other examples could be mentioned and if their number was not very large this was no doubt because university education did not provide its students with a sufficiently flexible and polyvalent approach to life.

As a goal of education, "excellence" was not in itself sufficient. Without development no university was worthy of its name. "Relevance"—commitment, attachment to social reality—was also necessary, even if only to create the conditions necessary for excellence.

"Participation" was another rather abstract and ill-defined concept. It covered at least three types of relationship between students and the university:

- participation as such, direct student involvement in decision-making;
- negotiation, in which student associations discussed and bargained with the university authorities in order to obtain something;
- consultation, in which students presented their views within the framework of flexible structures with no power of decision.

However, it was impossible to define once and for all the extent of each of these three kinds of co-operation and it was quite conceivable that consultation, for example, could be transformed progressively into participation.

The exchange of academic staff was one of the aspects of the "regionalization" to which reference had been made. Exchanges between Malaysia and Indonesia had been very successful but basically a country should rely on its own people for its development.

Mr. **Pinholt** spoke about problems in Denmark where higher education, although developed, was not in all respects adapted to present-day society. The inheritance of the past still weighed heavily on the universities which were traditionally oriented towards research and training for research. In consequence studies took a very long time and led to the award of a single terminal degree. No intermediate provision was made: students either remained at university until they obtained the degree, or left without any qualification. Greater flexibility and diversity were needed. There was an increasing interest in shorter courses of study leading to the award of basic qualifications, which could give access to subsequent specialization.

In Denmark there was also a problem of providing higher education in rural and backward areas. Norway had set an interesting example by creating a university in Tromsø to solve some of the special problems of its northern region. However, the mere production of graduates in a region would not guarantee its development; it was necessary to ensure that they remained in the region, and this was the real difficulty. Other tasks for the future were to develop facilities for life-long education and to create more retraining courses for former graduates.

Universities in Denmark had come to accept that students had an important rôle to play. It was through them that the university could best understand society and indeed itself. Students could, of course, create difficulties, but they obliged the university to come to grips with a number of problems, including political ones, and to examine the real meaning of what it taught. An enquiry carried out jointly by students and by workers at the Carlsberg brewery could be mentioned as an illustration of the ability of students to focus attention on social problems.

Datuk Dr. ARRAFIN referred to Professor Legge's comment that to speak of the needs of society could be simply to beg the question. This criticism did not apply to the developing countries where the needs loomed so large that it was impossible to mistake them.

Professor SINGH again emphasized that intellectual life made its own particular demands and that universities failed in their calling if they did not try to satisfy them. It should not be forgotten that many of the greatest philosophers and almost all the great scientists had come from universities. If the university became impoverished, the whole of intellectual life would suffer. And this would certainly happen if the university ceased to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and allowed itself to become a mere extension of the school. Certainly every university had both a local and a national rôle to play, but it also had an international rôle, that of contributing to the advancement of knowledge. It was the responsibility of the university to establish its own standards. Bad universities led to bad schools and these in turn led to bad universities. To avoid this, it was necessary to resist the pressures which led to a lowering of standards and often to the establishment of underequipped universities. The creation of special preparatory faculties for the most underprivileged sections of the population, such as those set up in the Soviet Union, was to be welcomed, but university education itself should continue to consist in the training of an élite.

The university should not be socially "committed" in the sense of placing itself at the service of an ideology. But it did have responsibilities toward society; the maintenance of the quality of intellectual life was one of these.

The Chairman of the session, Professor EL SHERIF, referred in conclusion to the speed with which knowledge and methods were now developing. Universities were also developing, but had difficulty in keeping pace, and sometimes this was noticeable in the training they gave. Moreover, the rapidity with which changes were taking place made it difficult to predict future needs for high-level manpower. Perhaps the universities should not allow themselves to become too concerned about the employment prospects of their graduates. Some who were not needed today might be needed tomorrow. And in a broader sense, they were always needed, particularly in developing societies. Even in the most humble of posts, they could provide intellectual stimulus and help to spread a little light amongst the masses, too often abandoned to their ignorance.

Professor El Sherif then closed the session.

THE UNIVERSITY, ITS INNOVATORY ROLE IN SOCIETY

On the third day of the seminar the chair was taken by Dr. Cyril E. Fiscian who introduced the theme and invited Professor Legge to present his paper. The outline of a second paper which was to have been presented by Dr. Z. Salazar is included as an appendix to this report.

PROFESSOR J.D. LEGGE
Department of History
Monash University

One of the themes of student radicalism in Australia has been that universities, despite their claim to adhere to traditional principles of disinterested learning, have in fact been the servants of the society about them, sharing its values and, indeed, promoting them. They are not innovators but conservers—conserving an essentially corrupt social order. Supported in the main by public funds, the universities obey their social masters and have thus betrayed their true vocation.

The argument clearly has at least some substance. In certain obvious ways, of course, all universities in technologically advanced countries do service the society which supports them, training its professional men, its administrators and, in some degree, its technicians. A great part of their research is directed to "useful" ends and, if they are to be judged as performing an innovatory rôle, it is in this general area of technical innovation that their impact is likely to be most spectacular, ranging from heart transplants, plant breeding, structural engineering, or what have you, to the contributions that economic theory may make to development programmes or that sociology may make to urban renewal plans. Even at a more rarefied level, though the pursuit of fundamental research may not lead immediately to useful practical consequences, it is a standard part of the scientist's justification of himself that his methods have made possible man's control over nature and that, in any case, useful application of his work may be developed later. Even the ideal of knowledge for knowledge's sake tends in this way to be underpinned by hopes of practical gain in the end.

The radical criticism, however, is directed not so much to the rôle of universities as technical innovators, or as the suppliers of efficient doctors, lawyers, engineers and so forth, but to their function as guardians or shapers or critics of values. And here the question becomes more tricky.

According to liberal theory, which still stands firm against the radical criticism of it, universities do indeed have a rôle to play in the shaping of social values. It is not a positive and directing rôle but is seen essentially as a critical one. The task of the universities is to question firmly held assumptions, to challenge prejudice, to assist society in forming or changing its perception of itself, and to serve as sanctuaries where argument is open and where thought cannot be coerced except by argument. They are not "citadels of truth", to quote Dr. Salazar's summary, but places where the question "What is truth?" is never finally answered.

Is this, perhaps, a passive concept? The liberal tradition would answer "No". In a world where pressures for conformity are strong and where efforts at thought control are common, it is vital to social health that there should be a place where complete freedom of thought must be preserved. To strive strenuously to preserve it is indeed a positive contribution. However, it is in the performance of this very rôle, so the radical critics argue, that the universities have failed most signally. They have *not* preserved that freedom through which the *status quo* may be criticized. They have been, on the contrary, the defenders of the *status quo* rather than critics of it.

Up to a point such a situation is, of course, to be expected. Universities are creations of society and in performing their functions as guardians or critics of values they are hardly likely to stray too far from the norms of the community to which they belong. Dr. Salazar may have overstated his case, but there is something in his argument that only when society is in a process of rapid change can the universities really be agents of change. When society is stable the universities are more likely to mirror its values than to reject them. To this extent their conservatism is open and natural. It is reinforced by the growth of mass culture—by the emergence of a more homogeneous society. Two recent American observers, Jencks and Riesman, see university conservatism in America as being of comparatively recent origin. There was a time, they argued in the pluralistic society of America in the early 19th century, when colleges sought positively to represent particular views and to disseminate them in the surrounding, and possibly hostile, society. Since it was clear that no single group of men had the power to shape society as a whole, minorities moved to the creation of "special interest" colleges each serving a relatively unified establishment. In some cases the special interest colleges may have hoped that their vision would ultimately be accepted by, or imposed on, others. More typically a recognition of the fact that this would not happen was rationalized in "liberal" terms. It was argued that variety of ideas was of social value in itself and that the conflict of ideas was the pathway to truth. Be that as it may, the special interest colleges, so Jencks and Riesman argue, could not survive the place of social change in America and in due course old universities changed and new universities emerged,with their highly developed graduate schools, to serve the new meritocracy. The earlier sub-cultures were transitional and were absorbed into a new homogeneity. An "upper-middle class style" became the dominant culture; and the universities became harnessed to its needs. They came simultaneously to reflect and to support the new homogeneity *.

The radical criticism goes a good deal further than making that kind of point, however. It holds not merely that the universities serve society, in a more or less open way, providing the men to run the meritocracy and inculcating the values appropriate to it. Their support of the *status quo* and their failure to play the rôle of effective critics is seen not as an open and perhaps natural conservatism but rather as a covert and unconscious conservatism, which flows as a direct consequence from the liberal tradition itself. The universities have been led into failure *by the very nature of their own most cherished principles.* Their professed devotion to the truth and their adherence to the methods of open enquiry in order to reach it, their devotion to the goal of pursuing the argument wherever it may lead, and to the ideal of objectivity—these things, it is said, are heavily charged with sinister purpose. They are designed, in subtle fashion, to draw the teeth of genuinely radical criticism and they thus, in unobtrusive manner, prop the existing social order. Objectivity is conservative *by its very nature*, and disinterested enquiry is a myth. He that is not with us is necessarily against us, says the radical, and his claim to detachment and to the preservation of scholarly integrity is a subtle tool to be used in support of the existing system. Enquiry that claims to be disinterested is in fact the handmaiden of capitalism.

---

* Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, New York, 1968.

Leaving aside the question of whether radical social change should be desired by all right thinking people, it is worth exploring further this view—the view that universities have resisted change not overtly but covertly—perhaps unwittingly but certainly inevitably. Certainly, just as there are always at least some grounds for seeing the state, even in a democratic society, in Lenin's terms as the weapon of a ruling class, or the courts as enforcing partial law, so there are cases enough where universities may be seen to act on the side of existing order and against change, to be cowardly in the face of powerful interests or, perhaps worse, casual and thoughtless in supporting an establishment. The unobtrusive application of political tests in the appointment or promotion of staff members, the acceptance of funds for defence contracts or for research specifically designed to serve the interests of a particular firm or industry, are not unusual. But there are other examples where universities have protected the freedom of conscience of their turbulent members or where they have pursued research in the face of hostile business pressure, or where, for reasons of principle or of prudence, they have passed by the opportunity to secure research funds because of the possibility that acceptance might erode their independence. It would not be easy to make out a balance sheet.

Further, examination of the question must notice at the outset the irony of the fact that the very traditionalism of universities may in some measure make them indeed resistant to the demands of society rather than the submissive servants of it. The conservatism of universities in matters touching their curricula, their teaching methods or their methods of government, is a byword. There is a self-perpetuating character about that conservatism. Academic élites train their successors by a system of apprenticeship in which the apprentices gradually acquire the values of the academic establishment and come to share its views and its purposes. Ultimately they become eligible for appointment to the élite in their turn on the basis, largely, of their having imbibed those values. The whole procedure contains an in-built set of pressures which are bound to stand as a barrier to change. But the same procedures also make for academic independence—a jealously guarded independence that enables universities sometimes to reject outside demands. The preservation of autonomy and academic independence is a prerequisite for dissent.

This leads to a second irony. It is the adherence by the universities to the ideals of free enquiry that enables the radical criticism of those ideals to be expressed. And here lies, of course, the essence of the liberal theory of the rôle of universities as critics and shapers of values. According to the theory, that rôle must be an indirect rather than a direct one. It is part of the credo that the university as such, while vigorously defending the framework of free enquiry, must as an institution be neutral in all matters of substance arising from the enquiry. The critical function, the challenges to established assumptions, the value innovations, must come from individuals or groups within that sheltered framework but not from the university itself. There are good prudential reasons for this. If the university does identify itself with a particular view on questions of social order, for example, this may in the end invite counter-attacks from powerful interests and threaten its ability to preserve its freedom. The innovatory function of the university is thus, in brief, simply to provide an environment for dissent, and not as an institution to be a spokesman for it.

The radical rejects, of course, the ideal of neutrality, or rather he would deny that it has any genuine substance. Once again it is held to be only a cover for partisanship on the conservative side. If there is no commitment to revolution there must necessarily be a covert defence of an established order. Failure to oppose the establishment is necessarily to support it. And the record of universities under pressure, alas, does provide some evidence to support that view. One has only to recall the failure of German universities in the face of the rise of Nazism to wonder whether neutrality is always the posture to be maintained. Yet—and here is a third irony—it is surely odd that, in an essentially conservative social environment like that of Australia the radical should call on the universities, which he regards as supportive of the *status quo*, to make a positive commitment—a commitment on Vietnam, a commitment on apartheid in sport, or on investment by international corporations in New Guinea, to mention three of the issues that have served to focus Australian student dissent in the last four years. If the students are right in believing that the universities in fact support the values of the society about them, a university stand on issues of this kind would hardly be the sort of stand that the radicals would like to see.

The paradoxes remain then, in the Australian debate between two main conceptions of the purpose of universities. University neutrality is seen by the radical as conservative in intent and by the liberal as the essential framework of dissent. And the very existence of the student movement is held by the latter to support his view. The universities, while in some ways no doubt serving the needs of the meritocracy, have become the home of a generational challenge to the meritocracy. The student movement is itself, if you like, a very powerful expression of the university's rôle as innovator, at least as the traditionalist conceives it.

⁂

The issues involved in this continuing debate may seem rather remote from reality in the eyes of universities in societies where life is more real and more earnest than it is in Australia. Is the notion of academic neutrality a luxury that only affluent societies can afford? Perhaps in countries where society is in process of rapid change intellectuals do have more positive obligations to serve the needs of their community. In countries where a tenuous sense of national identity is cut across by communal or cultural divisions, for example, it may well be argued that universities have a responsibility to depart from a traditional neutrality and detachment—that their task is positively to promote unity and even to play their part in the fashioning of an integrating ideology. At the very least there is likely to be an urgent need for trained administrators and technicians, men who will have a special responsibility in the forming of national policy—the technocrats who will manage the economy, the bureaucrats who will staff a civil service, the diplomats who will service foreign relations, as well as the engineers, doctors, and others whose utility needs no elaboration. The training of these servants of the community may be expected to include the inculcation of the values which would contribute to their dedication, perhaps even the framing of a new orthodoxy, or at least the fostering of a cultural consensus in much the same way as a classical training once provided a world view for a whole generation of Britain's administrators. In ways such as these the universities may be called on to perform a nation-building function rather than a critical and dissenting function. Their task in these circumstances is not to challenge society but to support it. (The critical function may be required also, of course. The Indonesian students who came out on to the streets in 1966 were operating on a level of political reality far removed from the programmeless revolutionaries of Australian campuses.)

Whether, of course, even in the special circumstances of social change and precarious stability, these tasks of nation-building should be the duty of universities as such or merely of individuals or groups within them may be a matter of debate, but at least there could be a case for the view that in these situations there is less place for ivory towers than there is in the technologically advanced world.

These will be questions for others to argue. In Australia the liberal tradition remains that the interests of those who wish to change the world and who look to the universities to be in the vanguard of change, and of those who look to them to conserve a traditional academic heritage are alike best promoted by the neutrality of the institution as such, whatever may be the commitments of its members. A university may provide a home for militant student action which, in sophisticated fashion seeks to politicize the moderates and to extend a revolutionary philosophy. The same institution may attract students to a graduate programme in business administration financed by the business establishment and designed to train technocrats for the modern corporation. Pluralism, argument, debate, conflict within a neutral institutional framework—these are the ways in which universities may best fulfil their innovatory function.

This traditional concept of institutional neutrality and freedom of individual expression is, of course, the product of particular historical circumstances. It is, I suppose, essentially a nineteenth century creation—a product of a pluralistic society where power was diffused and where no one group could easily coerce others. But to point to the historical origins of the ethos is not to invalidate it.

⁂

I began this paper by posing the argument in terms of innovation and change versus conservatism. In the course of my attempt to describe the current alignment of opinion in Australia this argument has become confused with the related but distinct argument about the virtues of neutrality and intervention respectively. The radical, of course, is an interventionist. He demands the commitment of the university itself to radical change. This is its function, he believes. Only by such a commitment can it fulfil its intellectual duty to the community about it. But the thoroughgoing conservative is also, in a sense, an interventionist —and he is seen as such by the radical. In the eyes of the latter the conservative *has* his commitment—a commitment to resist change—and he is able to impose this on the university. In the account that I have given of what I believe to be the prevailing view—the liberal tradition as I have called it—change, or the desirability of it, is an open question; change is allowed for but the university as an institution must stand apart from it. This is the genuine non-interventionist position.

It must be admitted, however, that there is a certain blandness in this way of putting the argument. The very case that I have tried to suggest—that neither innovation nor conservatism is the function of the university as such, that both are necessary and that both are best served by institutional neutrality—is, of course, the establishment view, the very view that, in radical eyes, is calculated covertly to support the *status quo*. The critics of it would insist that the account I have given is itself a clear example of the inevitability of conservatism. Merely to say that institutional neutrality enables dissent to be expressed is, in effect, to deny by artificial balance the force of the dissenting view. It is therefore to be interventionist on the conservative side rather than strictly neutral as it claims to be. No answer to that charge is likely to convince the critic: but the view that he criticizes—the traditional liberal view of the rôle of the university—still represents the established view of Australian academic life. Challenged by the radicals it is not yet seriously in retreat.

The debate, nevertheless, continues in the form of fluctuating generational conflict, with embattled university authorities—at least in their own eyes—defending the traditional wisdom against student attack, but in so doing laying themselves open, in some measure, to the charge that the neutrality they defend is, in reality, a servile support of a rotten social order. It is indeed very difficult for universities, when faced by the threat of student violence, to avoid reacting in a way which seems to be in direct contradiction to their principles. In the conflict there are echoes of other well-known polarities—between order and turbulence, between classicism and romanticism, between stability and revolution, even between form and spirit. Universities under attack from within often appear to emphasize tradition, order, form, at the expense of living dangerously, and in defending themselves they may indeed lose something of their proper character, and come more and more to resemble the picture that their radical critics draw. They are therefore tremendously vulnerable. Academic health depends on a delicate balance—on the continuing tension between such opposites and not on the victory of one over the other. The complete triumph of order over revolution would be as disastrous as the reverse.

Sometimes the student revolutionaries sense this, even as they mount their revolutions. In my own university a student taking part in a storming and occupation of the administration building in support of a demand for the reinstatement of three expelled students was asked "Do you think that the Vice-Chancellor, if he had the power (which he has not) to readmit the three students, should now give way to the demand for their reinstatement?" "No" replied the student. "That would be weak. It would be an improper surrender in the face of pressure". "Well, what do you think you are all doing in invading the administration building?" he was asked. "We are playing *our* rôles, and we expect the Vice-Chancellor to play *his*" was the reply.

It is possible, at the moment, to take a moderately optimistic view of the Australian campus situation. At times the phenomena of sit-ins, the rejection of the discipline system, and the signs of a sophisticated manipulative strategy directed by a small group, but able to feed on a broader, though unfocused, student malaise, have seemed ominous. Universities are vulnerable institutions and there are some of us who have felt that, if students did choose to push their attacks on the academic establishment far enough they could destroy the liberal fabric of the university tradition [*]. But the ebb of the tide over the past year or so has given hope that traditional academic values may survive. The radical attack, using particular grievances to mobilize support for a long-term disruptive objective is, after all, a minority attack. (Even the minority are not always clear about their ultimate goals, and they don't try to be. They see themselves as shaking an establishment but they present no programme for reaching a final objective. That, it seems, must be left to look after itself. In the meantime manipulation of the student mass, politicization of moderate opinion, and disruption of academic routine, hopefully to the point of a temporary closure of the university, are goals in themselves.) The great majority of participants in the resulting disturbances, however, are passive. They may be moved by a particular issue of grievance, which the minority can manipulate—linking it to more general issues and capitalizing on the romanticism of the passive majority. In John Searle's analysis of the anatomy of student revolt [**] the selection of an issue on which student opinion may be aroused involves the linking of specific grievances to larger "sacred" questions. "The religious impulse—the search for the sacred—is primary" he argues. Once such a linkage is established the further steps—the creation of an adversary relationship with the university, and the rejection of constituted authority—are easily achieved. But if the specific grievance is removed, the conscious minority must seek for a substitute issue, and the power of the minority over the majority is to that extent always precarious. It becomes more and more difficult to play upon the sense of the sacred, and to conceal the element of manipulation.

Yet this fact does not in itself remove the sense of threat that universities face, and if one may be moderately optimistic about it all it is a moderate optimism only. The radicals may yet have the last word, not in the sense that they appear to expect it, but in a more fundamental sense. The real challenge is not, perhaps, from the overt political radicalism of the minority seeking to erode the structure of society, but from the more pervasive, more inchoate, counter-culture. The counter-culture takes many forms. The opposition to established constraints is part of it, whether the constraints of razors and of dress or those of examinations and the discipline of study. One observer of the modern campus scene in Australia has spoken of the "revolt against science" with its strenuous discipline, and the pursuit of instant gratification *. The cult of instant gratification might express itself in violence. (To quote another of the student rebels of my own campus, the essential thing in student revolt is not the programme of revolt or the specific grievances which serve to get things moving; what matters is the confrontation itself—the direct experience of confrontation which has to be lived through.) Or it may express itself in the simple rejection of the prolonged and arduous study necessary for the attainment of knowledge. Truth is not available to be seized instantly, and the impatience of the modern student with discipline and, indeed, his rejection of the whole work ethic of established society, is a rejection of some of the central values of the traditional university.

---

[*] It should be made clear that I am here referring to student attacks which go far beyond the demand for the removal of specific grievances. On many questions—representation on deliberative bodies, consultation on matters of curricula, participation in the shaping of university policy—students by direct action have achieved significant and legitimate reforms. But much of the stir has not been about these things. There has been a broader strategy aimed at other ends—forcing universities to be repressive, bringing police on to campus, securing a temporary closure. This strategy, for a time, seemed to pose a major threat to the liberal tradition.

[**] John Searle, *The Campus War* (Pelican 1972), pp. 14-17.

Given these changes of temper of the undergraduate community, or at least of large sections of it, the universities in Australia have reason to be apprehensive about their ability to preserve their traditional character. In these days the defenders of the liberal tradition do, at times, have a sense of the presence of the barbarians at the gates.

⁂

The threat to university freedom that seems urgent to me may not seem urgent to those who are coping with the compelling problems of communal conflict and economic development, and for obvious reasons. Different circumstances have imposed a different view of the social tasks which universities have to perform. Asian society presents challenges to which the academic—and his students also—can respond with satisfaction. In the face of these challenges niggling doubts about freedom and autonomy may seem precious and remote from reality.

Nevertheless, the Australian experience, which this paper has attempted to describe, may have genuine lessons for those in more difficult circumstances. The Asian academic consensus resembles that of the Australian radical student in that it is frankly interventionist. Its content is, of course, very different: it holds that universities should be supportive of society while the Australian student radical wishes that universities would set themselves in opposition to society. But both would impose a positive rôle and both imply, in consequence, an orthodoxy. There are academic dangers, even for Asian universities in that fact. The view that universities must, as institutions, be engagé—not merely the producers of the agents of change but themselves the agents of change—may seem on the face of it very attractive until one comes to consider who is to define and interpret that responsibility, and to say what it is to mean in practice. The fact of the matter is that governments are likely to be the interpreters. In circumstances where there is no overt conflict between government and

---

* John A. Passmore "Revolt Against Science", Oscar Mendelsohn Lecture, Monash University, 1972.

university the problems are for the time being concealed; but can even the most patriotic academic believe that he will be forever in tune with his government? There is always the possibility that universities will be asked by governments to accept duties that may seem to them to run counter to society's long-term interests. It is not hard, for example, to imagine a government deciding that political science and history are dangerous subjects while economics (of the right sort) or agricultural science or engineering are useful and important. How should the engaged academic respond to such external assessments of what the university should do?

One may try to play down the danger. "Universities must serve the needs of their society": "Universities must preserve their autonomy". These may seem, after all, to be merely slogans—and slogans which, moreover, do not necessarily contradict each other. But slogans are not unimportant. If one holds firmly enough to the second of these slogans one might convince even governments of the importance of preserving universities as fields of free enquiry. If universities accept too readily the first slogan, however, they may find themselves requiring their members to conform to an orthodoxy imposed from without, or performing in the name of society, tasks which they may find unacceptable. Academic freedom is a fragile commodity and needs to be defended at all times.

With this consideration in mind it may be suggested that the Australian experience is more relevant to the Asian case than may at first appear. The Australian students' attack on university detachment is the mirror image of the Asian academics' defence of university engagement—and each may threaten academic autonomy in the name of the orthodoxy of the day. Perhaps Dr. Salazar's summary strikes the right balance. He speaks of the emergence in the Philippines of a consensus to the effect that the university should be involved in social change and indeed in the re-structuring of society itself ; but he points out that differences remain about the nature of the renovated society and about the means to be used to arrive at it. The existence of those differences may guarantee the kind of openness and tolerance and independence that seem to me to be of the essence of academia.

Discussion

The Chairman of the session, Dr. Fiscian, thanked Professor Legge and opened the discussion.

Dr. GOHEEN congratulated Professeur Legge on his excellent description of the situation in the "Western" countries. One further element had now made its appearance in the United States. The actions of the extreme left had aroused the extreme right and it too had begun to attack the universities, claiming that they had betrayed the fundamental values of American society. One of the consequences of this climate of threats and mistrust was that it had become more difficult for universities to obtain funds.

The liberal university must be defended against these attacks and must itself refuse any rigidly closed concepts and be ready to accept new elements of truth wherever they might appear. In this sense, the liberal university was predisposed towards innovation, but it was also the guardian of its own inherent values, notably independence and neutrality.

Professor **Legge** said that student protest movements in the developed countries were really very similar in their style and in the vocabulary they used. In Australia, however, they had made their appearance later than in the United States and the awakening or arousal of the extreme right wing had not yet occurred.

Dr. **Yip** maintained that the innovatory rôle of the university could not be defined in the abstract. It depended on the needs of society and these were very different in developed and developing countries. In the South East Asian countries the universities felt very strongly that they should contribute to economic and social development, and despite the difficulties they encountered, they were generally more optimistic and sure of their mission than the universities in the West.

However, merely to provide the quantities and kinds of high-level manpower specified by society was to play only a passive rôle. The universities should be associated much more actively with economic, regional and national planning. They should not only provide basic information for it but also help to define priorities and make choices. They should not merely be bodies to which certain tasks could be allocated, they should also be agents of change in their own right—initiators of development. To achieve this, they should direct their research toward the social and economic realities of the country and not let their goal be the publication of the greatest possible number of articles in international scientific journals. "Relevance" should take precedence over "excellence", in the sense in which it might be defined in an international setting, divorced from the real needs of a particular country. This was specially important in developing countries where there were very few other institutions capable of carrying out research. In Indonesia the universities had now been asked to participate in planning and to suggest development priorities. This was a step in the right direction. The Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development, set up in Singapore following a joint Unesco-IAU study, could probably encourage developments of this kind.

The Chairman, Dr. **Fiscian**, suggested that the distinction between "relevance" and "excellence" might be largely artificial. Excellence did not depend on the goals of research or education, but on the methods used to achieve them.

Professor **Mulumba** said that social commitment should not be completely identified with the innovatory rôle. Nor should neutrality be mistaken for objectivity. Neutrality involved a sense of detachment and of passive indifference. Objectivity, on the contrary, presupposed an active understanding of reality, and a clarity of thought, unaffected by professional preferences, capable of identifying different possibilities and of demonstrating their consequences. This was the objectivity required of the university. Its task was not to make choices—that was the responsibility of society—but to provide a sound basis on which they could be made.

The question, should universities in developing countries study only the urgent problems of their society or should they devote part of their resources to fundamental research, was one which it was unwise to answer too hastily. The National University of Zaire felt that fundamental research was still necessary in every university. Without it, a university could lose its active link with the development of knowledge and thus find itself cut off from the source of its vitality.

Professor **El Sherif** said that, as an institution, the university could only be understood in the context of the society which created it, maintained it, and endowed it with particular functions.

Universities were jealous of their independence and sensitive to any interference they judged unwarranted. Doubtless they were right, if the interference was really unwarranted, if it prevented them from carrying out their functions properly, for example, in the organization of teaching. Nevertheless, they did have a "master". It was arguable whether this should be society in general or the government. There seemed to be nothing improper in their research objectives being set by whoever financed them. But there could be no question of prescribing the choice of research methods, this should remain a matter for the university—still less of predetermining results. On no account should a university be required to arrive at a particular conclusion. This, quite obviously, would deprive it of the means of carrying out its proper functions.

In the developing countries it seemed clear that research objectives should be related closely to the needs of society. An order of priorities had to be respected and fundamental research could not be considered of prime importance in conditions of underdevelopment. It should not be forgotten that such conditions were often characterized by almost medieval ways of thinking, and it was one of the tasks of the university to teach and to help the people to evolve, without concerning itself overmuch with "excellence".

The "Student Revolt" was much easier to explain than to resolve. The educational system and the university itself sought to inculcate in its students a way of life and a set of values which subsequently they saw repeatedly flouted in a world of exploitation and killing. This was a world problem and one which the university could not solve alone.

Dr. **Mei** pointed out that the rôle of the university had always been to integrate apparently contradictory values. In a constantly changing world, it should seek to maintain a proper sense of perspective. It had to try to find a balance between the various tasks it was called upon to perform. Certainly, it had to serve society and to justify the often heavy expenditure devoted to it. Society had short-term needs and these had to be satisfied, but it also had long-term needs and these required thorough investigation and planning to prepare for the future. Governments changed but universities remained; the heat of controversy was often dissipated rapidly but the debate of major issues should be pursued with calm resolution. The university should be socially committed but indirectly, at a level above the vicissitudes of the day-to-day political struggle. It should be neither an ivory tower nor a battlefield of partisan conflict. Its rôle was to stabilize as well as to develop, to conserve as well as to innovate, or rather create. For in this context it would have been better perhaps to have spoken of the creative and not merely the innovative rôle of the university.

The university conserved and transmitted values primarily through its teaching function: it created new ones through its research. In this connexion it should not be thought that fundamental research was always expensive and therefore beyond the means of universities in poor countries. Marx had not needed expensive equipment in order to evolve a doctrine which had influenced history most profoundly.

If it abandoned research and its innovatory rôle, the university might soon become the mere spokesman of established knowledge. This would deepen the unrest of students who saw the imperfections of the world and wanted it at least to show some sign of movement.

There was no denying the differences between universities in rich and poor countries and even these groups differed profoundly from one country to another. Yet all universities shared a common relationship with knowledge and with creativity. To maintain that universities in developing countries should devote themselves exclusively to the most urgent tasks was to miss a valuable opportunity. In countries where so much still remained to be done there was greater scope for creativity, for the designing of utopian models for new societies. But in the rich countries the universities were implanted in societies which were already developed and which had already embarked on a course which was known to be wrong.

The Chairman, Dr. Fiscian, expressed his agreement with these remarks and again drew attention to the danger of assuming that concepts such as "excellence" and "relevance" were necessarily contradictory.

Professor Santoso said that Indonesia was trying not to be too dogmatic in these matters. The government, various social institutions and the universities were all seeking to develop the country. But although they shared the same objective, each had its distinctive field of action. It was through the university that society was able to examine itself and study possibilities for its development. Work was being undertaken in three major areas: science and technology, social organization, and history and anthropology (which sought to restore to the nation all the riches of its past).

Such activities could lead to innovation at various levels. In technology, for example, it could involve improving existing methods and processes, introducing more modern processes, and discovering and inventing completely new ones. In the social and cultural sphere, it could be concerned with the creation of new values. The universities, moreover, were not merely seeking to innovate in the abstract, but to encourage the population to make use of innovation. Thus, students of agriculture, undergoing practical training in the rural areas, were themselves helping the peasants to improve their working methods.

Some research took the form of direct social service and this could be entrusted to the university by government departments (for example, a recent study of the salaries of civil servants) or by private concerns, under contract. In general, co-operation between the government and the universities was good as was co-operation between the different generations within the university. At the end of their third year, students could be given certain teaching responsibilities. This provided an opportunity for collaboration with senior members of staff and thus stimulated communication between the generations.

Dr. SEAH said that the word "innovation" was ambiguous. Was it an activity destined to overturn the existing social order or one which sought simply to make it work more efficiently and to adapt it? The notion of autonomy was also ambiguous. Did it imply that the university was free to call on the government for money without having to state for what it was needed or to account for its use? Or did it refer rather to a particular kind of internal university organization and administration?

Professor LEGGE replied that "innovation" could imply radical changes such as that demanded by some students, but usually it referred to a series of minor modifications and improvements, which might eventually lead to a general and widespread transformation of society.

It was true that the notion of "autonomy" raised rather delicate problems. The government was the main source of university finance and the amount of money it could provide was evidently limited. But the government should not place limits on its use; it should not earmark funds for particular purposes. In Australia, research funds were allocated through the Australian Universities Commission and once this had been done, each university was free in principle to use its share as it thought fit. However, if a university used funds for a purpose not approved or recommended by the Commission, it might find its requests refused the next time an allocation was made.

The Australian universities enjoyed complete autonomy in academic matters. But here too the situation was complicated. In effect, to use Professor El Sherif's expression, the universities did not have just one "master" but several: one, of course, was the government, but the universities also had to contend with their own councils, their various commitees and, in many matters, with their students themselves.

Professor OKATSU felt that the distinction between fundamental and applied research was rather outdated. A balance had to be maintained, of course, between theoretical work and practical application, but this was not a matter of choosing between alternatives. Scientific discoveries were being put to practical use with increasing rapidity and the interval between the moment of discovery and the time of its application was becoming so small that the two activities tended to be fused together. Complex technological achievements—such as the miniaturization of a bomb—rested on a considerable body of theoretical work and indeed sometimes themselves gave rise to extensive "fundamental" research. It was thus increasingly difficult to distinguish between the two aspects of research.

Mr. PINHOLT felt, nevertheless, that a difference remained between fundamental and applied research and that it was important to establish a satisfactory balance between them. This was not a question to be solved in the abstract. The balance could only be found as a function of the commitment of the university to society. But what did "commitment" mean? It was not enough to say that the university should be committed; it was necessary to state also to whom. Its commitment should not be to the government alone, but to all the people. Even a representative government did not represent all social groups. The university undoubtedly had special responsibilities towards the groups which were not represented, but which might well be the most dynamic. In setting its research objectives, the university should therefore have in mind much broader concerns than the mere facilitation of government action.

Professor Mulumba felt that fundamental research could from one standpoint be defined as a theoretical and systematic examination of long-term perspectives. If the university did not carry out this function, society would lack the bases essential for establishing long-term policies. This did not mean that it should refuse to carry out short-term projects to solve urgent problems. But when it did so, it should try also to show what other courses of action might have been open. Its vision should range beyond the limits of the individual tasks it accomplished. That was an important aspect of the function of objectivity.

Dr. Yip suggested another basis for distinguishing between two kinds of research. One was directed primarily to the expansion of knowledge for its own sake, and the whole world benefited from its findings. The other was concerned with the application of knowledge to the solution of the particular problems of a given country. When problems were as serious and urgent as they were in the developing countries, the universities should give priority to the second kind of research. They should train planners, collect the information required to formulate economic and social policy, carry out regional studies, and assist in the elaboration of master-plans. At present, such plans were often entirely drawn up by teams of foreign experts, and this was very expensive. They could certainly be very useful, but it was desirable for them to be supported by nationals of the country familiar with the language and local conditions. Unfortunately too many university people shunned practical tasks and were afraid of dirtying their hands. They had to be taught to wrestle with the real difficulties of the country. More student work camps could be set up, for example, and if sometimes the students were asked to carry manure, this would not be a tragedy.

The Chairman, Dr. Fiscian, reminded participants that universities, no matter what their country might be, were also members of the international university community.

Dr. Yip then took up the question of autonomy which had been referred to by earlier speakers. To allow universities too great a measure of autonomy was often to make it easy for them to succumb to the fascination of Western models. They would then train specialists for a highly sophisticated medical profession when the need was for "barefoot" doctors; and they would train managers for large American-type industrial and business concerns when a country's economy was based on small-scale enterprises.

Professor HAMZAH remarked that there were two attitudes to phenomena, and hence two approaches to research. One was directed to observation and analysis, the other to application (even if this often presupposed analysis). Confronted with a pile of boulders, the first approach would involve an attempt to describe with great accuracy their colour, be it red, pink or brown, or to know their origin; the second would ask what use could be made of them. Presented with a batch of frogs, the first would happily study the subtleties of their sexual life; the second would examine ways in which they might contribute to feeding the population.

University people often preferred the first kind of research. They also tended to work independently and, in Malaysia, research had been left very largely in the hands of individuals. It was now necessary to draw up a real policy for university research and to develop group and interdisciplinary research. If this was not done, the government might well withdraw research funds from the universities and give them to its own institutes.

Professor LEGGE stressed that he was not at all opposed to academics committing themselves and accepting the full implications of their action by undertaking the practical and even dirty jobs mentioned by Dr. Yip. But who was to judge what merited commitment, or what was "relevant"? Was it not rather dangerous to suppose that an institution, the university as such, could make and impose a decision? It was a matter for the individual to determine the nature of his commitment.

Professor EL SHERIF replied that when resources were scarce it was impossible to avoid setting priorities. For universities in developing countries this was a matter of deciding whether to give precedence to the expansion of knowledge or to the application of existing knowledge to social and economic development. If the question was put in this way, the answer was self-evident. When it began to industrialize, Japan had not hesitated to concentrate heavily on applied research and this was doubtless also true of the Soviet Union. It was only later that the two countries had embarked on fundamental research, but this proved that their universities had been able to conserve or to acquire the necessary intellectual resources, despite a phase of emphasis on practical issues. It was rather arrogant to think that universities were doomed to stagnation if they focused their attention on the concrete problems of their countries.

Professor OKATSU said that at the beginning of the Meiji era, which had initiated the country's modernization, Japan had indeed borrowed a great deal from the West. Foreign teachers had been brought to Japan at great expense and many students had been sent to study in far-off universities. At one time, half the education budget had been spent on acquiring this Western knowledge. However, it was not long before pure research came to be seen as a prerequisite for further development. If universities in developing countries felt they were not yet able to engage in pure research, they might be well-advised to send some students abroad for training in research. In a few years they would have need of them.

Professor SINGH argued that a university should be an open community of individuals devoted to the pursuit of knowledge. Such a community could not be "committed"; on the contrary, it was of its essence that the most varied opinions could be expressed and coexist within it.

Certainly, the university must serve society. However, this did not mean that it should be the handmaid of the government of the day which had no right *a priori* to impose on the university its own vision of the world, no doubt conceived in a limited perspective and tinted by opportunism. On the contrary, the university had to know how to resist pressures and to decide freely what to accept or refuse. Was it inconceivable that it might one day be asked to help organize a war psychosis in the country? It had to be capable of refusing. A free university was as much a cornerstone of democracy as were a free press and an independent judiciary. To serve democracy was also to serve society.

The dispute between pure and applied research was false; both were necessary. Similarly, it was dangerous to assert that the rôle of Asian universities differed from that of other universities. Their functions were basically the same.

Professor ZAINAL warned against false alternatives and abusive use of an "either ... or" approach. The maintenance of high academic quality was by no means incompatible with service to society. Intelligent co-operation with the State and agreement to pursue certain courses of action were not at all the same thing as submission to the dictates of a government. Moreover, research of local or national significance could very well be of interest elsewhere and enrich the international community as a whole. There was an example of this in the field of race relations. They posed a problem in Malaysia as they did in many other countries, including the United States, and the results achieved in one country could very well be put to use in another. The freedom of research must be maintained; but the freedom of the researcher to choose his subject and working methods could and should be reconciled with the acceptance of certain limitations. It might well seem irresponsible to expend a great deal of effort on the study of Chaucer in the context of present-day Malaysia.

Finally, intellectual training and enquiry should go hand in hand with moral training and enquiry. In a society encumbered by corruption or by enmity between different groups it was part of the university's duty to inculcate a sense of values in its students. The atomic bomb provided a spectacular example of the ethical implications of science.

Encik AINUDDIN did not agree that Asian universities should be the same as others. The rôle of a university could only be defined in the context of a concrete situation and a particular activity (for example, military training on the campus) might be justifiable in one case but reprehensible in another. Universities in Asian countries too often aped Western models. The time had come for them to find their own original solutions to their particular problems. If these were not always applicable in other countries this could not be helped. No more than elsewhere were the universities in Asia simply cogs in the government machine, but certain priorities had to be respected. Where men could not eat to the full, it would be intolerable to indulge in ruinous escapades on the moon.

Dr. **Yip**, replying to an earlier comment by Professor Legge, said that there were decision-making mechanisms for determining what was relevant. For example: the University Council would take decisions on matters of content and teaching methods, but would have to obtain government approval for the establishment of a new faculty, for it was the business of the government to avoid duplication in such matters. Disagreements over competence could certainly arise. For example, the State might leave the university free to introduce teaching in a new discipline or to undertake certain research, but then refuse to grant it the corresponding financial support. If this happened there was need for negotiation and a willingness to accept compromise. It was wrong to believe that the government necessarily sought to impose its will in an arbitrary way. There was dialogue and co-operation between it and the university and their relationship might be compared to a state of marriage.

Dr. **Mohammed Rashdan** remarked that although a great deal had been said about research, innovation must also find its place in matters of teaching content and method. One way in which the university could stimulate innovation in society was to encourage its members to work as consultants to public and private bodies.

The Rev. Father **Torralba** took up some of the questions raised by Professor El Sherif and said that in his opinion, in conditions of underdevelopment, the "master" of the university was the government. The rôle of the university was to help the country carry out the development programmes which it was the government's responsibility to define. Relations between the university and the government should be those of docility and intelligent subservience. This did not mean that the former could not play an important rôle and render very considerable practical services to the process of nation building, or, more modestly, to the development of the local community. Matters in which Xavier University, for example, had been able to assist the authorities included the drafting of fiscal legislation, the drawing up of plans for urbanization and the organization of retraining courses.

The kind of research which could be undertaken in developing countries was conditioned by circumstances. It was patently obvious that a university should not try to undertake research for which it was not equipped and its work would be all the more useful if it were based on a careful evaluation of its real capabilities.

The problems of student unrest were complicated; they took many different forms and had many different causes. If they were the work of small groups of revolutionaries manipulated from outside, as was often the case, the university must defend itself. But they were sometimes inspired by justified indignation against the flagrant violation of a basic principle. When this happened, the university should support its students wholeheartedly, and, if necessary, the rector should join in their demonstrations.

Professor **Rybnikov** made a number of comments on the responsibility of the universities to the people, as well as on the principles of the organization and planning of higher education. In the Soviet Union higher education was provided through a vast network of some 850 institutions. Obviously, such a system could not be left to its own devices, free, for example, to produce nothing but philosophers. Rigorous planning in higher education was indispensible within the framework of the planning of the economy and of public services. The opportunities offered by higher education and the obligations it imposed (for example, two years to be spent in designated employment following graduation) had to be determined in the light of the needs of society. However, since needs were not always completely foreseeable, adjustments sometimes proved necessary, and the plan was not rigid. Its margin of flexibility would, for example, allow more teachers to be trained than originally planned, if this proved necessary. Moreover, the educational system itself was diversified and could respond to different needs: it included, in particular, a very large network of evening and correspondence courses for those in employment. Admission to higher education was by competitive entrance examination, and this made it possible to maintain quality and the high standards to which reference had frequently been made during the discussion.

Higher education in the Soviet Union was the instrument of a policy directed towards the training of the high-level manpower and specialists needed to guarantee the prosperity and cultural development of the nation. This definition—and the necessity for planning which followed from it—could certainly be valid in developing countries even if they were very different from the Soviet Union.

Dr. **GOHEEN** was shocked by the use of the phrase "intelligent subservience" to describe the relationship between the university and the government. "Marriage" seemed to be a more appropriate term since it concerned a relationship between two partners. However, one should not believe that governments were necessarily progressive and enlightened, even if, happily, this was sometimes the case. It was therefore most important for the university to retain its critical function.

Professor **HAMZAH SENDUT** believed that there was a clash between two concepts of the university: that of the traditional university, very much concerned for its autonomy, and that of the modern university which accorded prime importance to development problems. Universities in the developing world belonged to the second category. They had assumed responsibilities for development and were resolved to carry them out. This was the message to participants in the seminar.

In their work for development the universities might well need to collaborate closely with governments, but it by no means followed that their position must remain a subordinate one and their influence on society slight and indirect. On the contrary, they might even acquire too much power, and some future IAU seminar might be asked to discuss ways of limiting it.

Professor **MULUMBA** said that universities were not set in the abstract, but in a living society and this meant that their activities were inevitably subject to the limitations of financial and political pressures. They weighed equally on teaching and research so that there was no need to differentiate between them in this context.

Mr. **Keyes**, referring to the Rev. Father Torralba's description of the way in which his university had come to be concerned with fiscal legislation and town planning, emphasized that in the developing countries the universities were likely to be involved more directly in the affairs of society than elsewhere. In the so-called developed countries, complex and extensive institutional structures had been built up, often over a long period. The mechanisms were still much more rudimentary in the developing countries and often the universities were the only institutions which possessed both the information and the intellectual resources needed to carry out a wide range of tasks. Even in the education sector, there was less institutional variety in the developing countries, and in most of them higher education had started with the establishment of a university. These universities had to respond to a wide range of demands, but, as Professor Hamzah had emphasized, they also occupied a more central and potentially more influential place in society than did universities elsewhere.

The Rev. Father **Torralba** did not refute this analysis, but explained that in the cases to which he had referred, his university had not been asked to help because it was the only available body—there were others—but because it was known for its objectivity and its ability to suggest alternative courses of action and appraise them rationally.

The Chairman, Dr. **Fiscian**, said that the time had to come to draw the discussion to a close. He again warned against the danger of generating unnecessary quarrels by using purely verbal labels which made complementary phenomena appear to be in opposition. Pure and applied research were above all complementary and the constant flow between them was there for all to see. How could there be any hope of transforming reality without employing theoretical knowledge which itself needed to be embodied in one form or another?

The Chairman then asked Professor Legge if he wished to reply to his colleagues' remarks.

Professor **Legge** reaffirmed the importance he attached to distinguishing between the individual members of the university, who were, he hoped, "committed", and the university as an institution, which he hoped would remain independent and open to the various currents of intellectual and scientific life. Dr. Yip wanted universities to be direct "agents of change", but would it not be better to say that their task was to train agents of change? For, as Dr. Mei had suggested, universities also had a stabilizing function and in certain respects they should all be basically similar, as Professor Singh had emphasized.

The desire of the universities in the region to take part in the development effort of their people was very understandable and this was Professor Hamzah's message. But it was necessary to move with caution; if the university came to consider that its main task was to be an instrument for carrying out government programmes, the consequence might well be a drastic erosion of its autonomy. The image of a marriage between the university and the government implied a more balanced relationship between the two partners. But it had to be remembered that the university was a difficult woman to live with and not a submissive and docile companion.

From the discussion it appeared that relations between the universities and the governments in the region were generally good. This was to be welcomed. However, there was no guarantee that the situation would not change and it was well to be prepared for such a contingency.

*The Chairman thanked **Professor Legge** and then closed the session.*

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present chapter contains an account of the discussions on the fourth and fifth days of the seminar which were chaired by Professor K.A. Rybnikov and Dr. Robert F. Goheen respectively. These two half-day sessions provided an opportunity to review and put into perspective what had been said earlier. The three themes were again considered but this time simultaneously and as facets of a common problem. The first of the sessions was originally intended to provide an opportunity for the observers to take part in the discussion and present their points of view. However, since most of them had already spoken, it took the form of a general review of the earlier discussions. On the fifth day the presentation of an aide-mémoire by the secretariat served as an introduction to the final exchange of comments and opinions which brought the seminar to a close.

⁂

Fourth Day

The Chairman, Professor Rybnikov, pointed out that although the difference in status between members of the seminar and observers had tended to disappear as the discussions progressed, several observers had not yet spoken. He therefore proposed first to call on them and, following this, to open a general discussion during which all participants would be free to express their views on any of the three themes or on other subjects they considered relevant.

Mr. Craig said that the Association of Commonwealth Universities had no official attitude toward the themes, and his remarks, therefore, would be of a personal nature.

The discussions had shown, if this was necessary, that there were great differences between university situations, attributable largely to the variety of historical and social contents in which universities had been created and developed. It was obvious that some situations demanded a greater degree of direct university participation in carrying out tasks of social importance, but it should not be forgotten that if the relationship of the university to society became one of subordination, this could have dangerous consequences for autonomy and academic freedom. Though there was a real conflict between the "traditional" and the "modern" university, this was perhaps not as deep-rooted as might appear during a discussion. If attention was directed away from the examination of theoretical models and concentrated on the study of specific examples of the behaviour of universities claiming to be of one kind or the other, it would be found that they nevertheless shared a number of common features.

It was true that universities in developing countries were in fact often anxious not to depart too far from the models of the older-established universities, in which they could find precedents to justify their actions.

In some parts of the world some of the proposals made during the seminar were already being put into effect: in Fiji, for example, a college had been established to provide short training courses for medical auxilaries. The University of the South Pacific had also introduced preparatory courses, similar to those in the Soviet preparatory faculties, to help students with inadequate secondary education reach the level required for admission to normal university studies. This was also being done in Nigeria.

Even in countries where the traditional university was most deeply rooted, there was movement and innovation. A notable example was the United Kingdom's Open University which had no formal admission requirements. In the United Kingdom there was also now a proposal to introduce a short course which would lead in two years to the award of a Diploma of Higher Education. British universities were actively engaged in public service and sometimes took very practical initiatives.

Professor ZAINAL emphasized that attitudes and values were of greater importance than purely technical considerations. The problem of the national language, for example, had more to do with attitudes than with the techniques of learning or adapting the language. Once the decision to learn a language had been made, it could quickly be mastered (as was proved by the example of members of the American Peace Corps who were able to use Malay after only a few months).

It was now becoming a basic task of the university and indeed also of the school, to shape the attitudes of its students. In Malaysia's multiracial society, racial harmony could only be achieved by making every citizen as Malaysian as possible. Language could play an important rôle in this, but use should be made of all opportunities offered by school education—particularly the teaching of history. History could be taught in such a way as to increase the attachment of young people to their country (this, it appeared, was being done in Japan). School curricula were therefore very important and they should be drawn up with great care.

It could not be denied, however, that such efforts to inculcate a set of values might be undermined by the corruption all too frequently evident in society. This made the cultivation of a sense of justice and integrity in students both more difficult and more necessary.

Encik ANNIS AHMAD drew attention to the close links between the three themes. Each of them raised, in its particular field, the basic question of the fundamental rôle of the university.

In the matter of language, there was no doubt that Malay could be a unifying factor in Malaysia. English was only spoken by a minority and it would be absurd to try to make it the general language of communication when Malay, which was easy to learn, was already spoken by the broad masses, including the illiterate. It was also to be noted that the introduction of Malay into higher education had been progressive in order to allow time for it to develop adequately for use at this level.

In economic terms, the existence of three languages quite clearly constituted a handicap and the effectiveness of expensively trained executives was obviously reduced if they were unable to communicate with the people whose interests they were expected to serve.

There was no serious graduate unemployment problem in Malaysia. if some graduates were without work, this was because they were too particular and disdained certain types of work. In contrast, others, who in Professor Aziz's words knew how to create a demand for their services, had taken very interesting initiatives. For example, a group of graduates of the University of Malaya, themselves from rural areas, had created a series of post-secondary institutions for underprivileged students who had not been able to enter the official institutions. Members of this group were spending a lot of their own money on the construction of buildings.

During the seminar, opinions had differed with regard to the crucial question of the rôle of the university. It had been said that the university had responsibilities to the international, the national and the regional or local community. This was no doubt true, but priorities might vary considerably according to circumstances. In the developing countries at least, service to the community must come before the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. But this did not mean the exclusion of all work of a fundamental nature. It was required in studying the needs and aspirations of a community and in examining long and short-term ways of meeting them. Long-term planning should not be neglected, and similarly, sacrifices should not be made of the prerequisites of certain long courses of training. Courses to train medical assistants in two or three years were all very well, but it was wrong to think that this would meet the need for qualified medical doctors. Unlike economics, which could be studied in a shorter period if the economy was more rudimentary, medicine made demands which did not depend on the level of a society's development.

Those who supported the concept of a university in the service of the national community should take their words to heart and not send their own children to study in the United Kingdom or Australia.

Service to the community did not imply docile acceptance of government directives. Malaysia at present was fortunate in having a good government, which facilitated co-operation. But the university should feel that its commitment was to the people as a whole.

Most students wanted to share in this commitment and were capable of giving it practical expression in a number of fields. Many spent their vacations in village communities, helping to improve sanitary, educational and social conditions, under a scheme run by the University of Malaya. In the University itself, and on a more modest scale, students had done a number of useful jobs; for example, they had built a small bus park for internal campus transport.

Since the question of student unrest had been raised, it should be pointed out that this was often a response to incomprehension, to a flat refusal to understand, which was most strikingly symbolized by the closure of universities in the event of student protest. However, this did not mean that destruction and violence should be condoned.

Students seemed capable of taking part in the running of the university and of contributing new and useful ideas. Of course, participation could not be introduced overnight in all fields. But at the University of Malaya, the process had been set in motion. Consulted in many matters, the students' suggestions were often well received and participation should be continued and developed.

The Rev. Father Torralba also spoke about all three themes. It seemed to him undeniable that a national language constitued a unifying factor, but what was meant by the term "national language"? Sometimes a foreign language was more widely understood in a country than any one of a large number of indigenous languages. If this language was suited to the needs of modern society and did not demand expensive development, why should it not be adopted as the national language? To take exception to it because it was foreign did not seem to make good sense, for it would not remain foreign for ever. It could be assimilated and appropriated by the country and become a variation of a wider species, albeit with its own special characteristics. After all, New York English was not the language spoken in London, but it was English all the same.

If, however, it had been decided to adopt an indigenous language and to borrow words from other languages, there should be no hesitation in altering the spelling if this made communication easier, since that was the basic function of words.

The elements making up the graduate employment problem differed from country to country and it was therefore pointless to look for a common solution to it. In some countries there were indeed too many graduates, in others it was obvious that there were too few. All that could be said in general terms was a matter of common sense—education and training must be planned on the basis of real needs. If there were too many lawyers and too few agricultural graduates, law studies must be cut and an effort made to provide more courses in agriculture. However, it was difficult to improvise in such fields. Education and training could obviously be adapted more effectively to needs if manpower planning formed a part of the government's general development plans.

In the Philippines the most serious problem was that of the brain drain, particularly in the medical and para-medical professions. There were about 8,000 Filipino doctors and as many nurses working in the United States. This very serious situation called for government action. Ways should be found of obliging graduates to work in their country for a certain period at least.

The most important innovatory rôle of the university in society was perhaps that of promoting social justice and human dignity. Too many people were hungry, uncared for and deprived of their basic human rights. The most important task of the university was to seek solutions to this problem.

Professor El Sherif said that the question of a national language did not arise in the Arab countries, although some subjects (notably medicine and engineering) might still be taught in a foreign language.

There was no serious graduate unemployment problem, at least in Egypt, but there were certain kinds of underemployment. There was now a plan under which an attempt was being made to assess social needs and in particular the need for places in higher education, taking into account the probable failure rate. This plan was not perfect, but it was being improved progressively. In addition, a central office selected candidates after assessing their interests and preferences at the end of secondary education. The government was obliged to find employment for all graduates, normally in Egypt but sometimes even abroad.

In view of the numerical expansion and development of universities in the Arab World, it was not certain that problems of graduate unemployment might not have to be faced in the future. However, these would be of secondary importance compared with those raised by the general transformation of society and the education of the masses. This was an area in which the universities had a very important rôle to play. In Egypt they were conducting research on a number of social problems and were also helping to bring knowledge to the people. Cairo University, for example, had an adult education centre which acted as an "open university", although study did not lead to the award of a degree. Some 3000 people were now enrolled.

The University sought to direct its research efforts towards the real needs of the country (some research was undertaken under contract with industry), but, as had already been emphasized, applied research did not mean "a-theoretical" research. Theory provided the direction and basis for investigation, and could in turn itself be enriched by some of the results achieved.

Professor Ungku Aziz added that although the Egyptian government provided employment for all graduates, the level of remuneration was fairly low, if his information was correct, in the region of £25 a month. This was an aspect of social justice not found in other developing countries, where the salary differential between graduates and non-graduates was often large. In Malaysia, for example, a young graduate could start by earning ten times as much as his peasant father.

Professor Mulumba said that language was not the only means for achieving national integration. In countries where it could not play this rôle, other means had to be used. This was the case in Zaire where there were four main languages. They did not share the same status, some were languages of particular groups, others, like Swahili, facilitated inter-group communications. Government efforts to impose the general use of one of them had met with strong opposition and consequently failed. At present the policy was to try to educate people to speak at least three of the four languages.

But national integration was being promoted particularly through economic measures. The complementary nature of the resources of the regions was being exploited to the full in order to demonstrate their interdependence. Thus the mining region in the south had been made dependent for its electrical energy on the north, where hydro-electric dams could be built.

With regard to the innovatory rôle of the university in society, it had already been pointed out that the University of Zaire was seeking to find an appropriate balance between fundamental research, which it considered essential, even in conditions of underdevelopment, and applied research. It was also seeking to develop interdisciplinary research, bringing together, for example, teams of engineers, economists, lawyers, sociologists, administrators and others to examine as a whole the many and varied problems of the mining industry. Instead of starting out from abstract concepts, the University was encouraging business enterprises and the government to specify their needs, so it could relate its training to them.

Professor Ungku Aziz said that linguistics resembled economics in that the rich could borrow much more easily than the poor. Languages rich in their own resources could adopt thousands of foreign elements without sacrificing their essential nature. This was certainly not the case of tribal languages with more rudimentary means of expression.

Dr. Goheen felt it necessary to clarify the concept of "excellence" which was often used too vaguely. It did not refer to a particular category of privileged objects, but to the quality of any given object. It could not therefore be claimed that an abstract speculation merited by definition a claim to excellence, or that a piece of applied research in agriculture or in economics was *a priori* excluded. The university was the home of organized thought, the place where it was discovered, exercised and spread abroad. What mattered most was the quality of thought, not the object of its attention. Excellence, therefore, could not as a matter of principle be incompatible with research into the means of satisfying the short or long-term needs of society.

The ideal of serving society was, of course, recognized very clearly by universities in America. A far-reaching philosophy underlay all their activities. One of society's most important needs was to have within it men and women capable of just and independent thought (and who were not simply receptacles and communicators of given knowledge). Universities tried to educate their students to be such men and women. The advancement of science, the cultivation of literature (including the study of Chaucer) contributed, in their view, to the enrichment of society. Admittedly all was not perfect. It was disturbing that a certain positivism had taken hold of the social and human sciences; its barrennes had doubtless contributed to the dissatisfactions of young people in recent years. But the troubles themselves had initiated change and provoked a re-examination of accepted values.

Traditional American values, and in particular those expressed in the Bill of Rights, were still very much alive in American universities, and sometimes led them to criticize government action.

The ethic of service to society was not, therefore, unique to universities in developing countries and did not distinguish, let alone isolate them from the rest of the international university community. There were, of course, priorities and it was quite legitimate for these universities to be specially concerned with the serious economic and social problems faced by their countries. But that should not lead them to cut themselves off from the rest of the world; knowledge was a worldwide phenomenon which thrived on international exchanges.

Dr. Fiscian, agreeing wholeheartedly, said that as the world grew smaller and smaller, too narrow a definition of the notions of community and society should be avoided. Today a university had to live on a world scale, if it did not it would decline. In the world of knowledge, no one should hesitate to borrow.

Dr. Yip emphasized that it was still necessary to clarify a number of points which had been made during the seminar. Who directed society? Who determined priorities and the relative urgency of problems? Finally, in the words of the general theme of the seminar, what were the obligations and opportunities of the university?

It was, of course, true that government and society were not synonymous. But society, as such, was too heterogeneous to be able itself to devise a clear policy. In a democratic country, although the government did not identify itself with society, it did at least represent it. The government, therefore, should establish policy directives. Although the university should be guided by these directives, it did not follow that its rôle should merely be that of the passive executive. It was the task of the university to discover present and future opportunities and to show how they could be used: it was in this sense that it should be an "agent of change".

Professor El Sherif pointed out that the seminar was not asked to agree on the matters raised by Dr. Yip since its purpose was not to reach decisions but to exchange views.

He believed that if a university really wanted to change society radically it should not be too preoccupied with problems of the employment or unemployment of its graduates. Even if they were underemployed, graduates constituted a reserve for change of great importance.

In order to avoid too great a disparity between university education and the practical needs of the employment market, it might well be appropriate for the university councils to include representatives of the outside world (government, business, industry, etc...). Such people would be able to provide useful information.

Dr. Yip disagreed on the first point. Was it reasonable, in a country with strictly limited resources, to spend a great deal of money on university education for people who would then become taxi drivers or office workers? This would be an intolerable waste.

Dr. Kasem again referred to the importance of the national language and the need to understand it not as a catalogue of expressions isolated from their real content, but as a living whole of the words and the ideas which they conveyed. Yet, too many universities in South East Asia stopped short: they used the words of the national language, admittedly, but often only as a garb for Western ideas. This was particularly noticeable in the courses of study which some universities composed simply by consulting English or American university catalogues. A pseudo-élite was thus formed, incapable of real communication with the people. Research should be undertaken into the types of courses and textbooks best suited to countries of the region.

A number of graduates and particularly medical doctors, were strangers to the community they were supposed to serve and went to work abroad, especially in the United States. This brain drain could be partially solved by requiring doctors to work in their own country for at least three years.

Mr. Pinholt felt that despite the widely differing points of view expressed during the seminar, there were areas of agreement.

First of all, whatever importance was attached to national problems, it had to be admitted that a university should remain part of the international network of exchanges. If it lived in a vacuum, it would no longer be stimulated with new knowledge coming from the outside, and thus risk losing its vitality and its ability to accomplish its mission in its own country. For most modern societies were characterized by movement, whereas the older societies in which universities were born were stable and static. The same kinds of training were not suitable for both types of society. Nowadays, the "well-adjusted" graduate was not one who had amassed a certain store of conclusions, but one able to come to grips with the mechanisms of evolution, to understand and spread understanding of processes throughout society, including understanding of the processes of society itself.

If this was to be done, it was not enough to provide students with courses to follow; they should be made to participate actively in the teaching process and in the shaping of their own education. They should be encouraged where possible to participate in research—a research freed from the restrictions of narrow disciplinarity. Social phenomena had to be taken out of the compartments to which they had been assigned and labelled: law, economics, sociology, and so on. Or, at least, communication between the compartments had to be established by a multidisciplinary approach.

Encik Ainuddin said that, although they might wish to serve society, many universities did not have an adequate sense of priorities. They were still much more concerned with transmitting knowledge than with training fully educated men, conscious of their social responsibilities. This worship of knowledge for its own sake was doubtless part of the Western inheritance; there, it had contributed to the development of a system of education which might not, after all, be so excellent for it had led to a generalized revolt of youth.

The entire educational systems of South East Asian countries had to be thought out afresh and freed from the norms which, although borrowed from the West, had since come to be accepted as a matter of course. What reason was there to believe that pre-university education should last 12 or 13 years, apart from the fact that this was the period required in the United Kingdom? Might it not be useful to reduce this to ten years, as in the Soviet Union?

Dr. Fiscian replied that it was certainly desirable to take account of local conditions, but excessive parochialism should be avoided. The need to remain on an equal footing with the rest of the international community was one factor which should help to determine the length of pre-university studies.

Professor Legge warned against the confusion likely to result from discussing commitment in excessively general terms, without taking account of the particularities of each discipline. Some—economics, for example—could be of direct help in meeting the needs of society. Others had a more indirect impact on society and it was important that their inherent qualities should not be sacrificed in an attempt to make them "more useful": The idea of employing history as a means of encouraging national feeling, for example, was open to serious question. And to oblige a university teacher to abandon Chaucer and retrain himself for some more "useful" activity might perhaps deprive a young society of many useful lessons.

The Chairman, Professor Rybnikov thanked participants and reminded them that the Secretariat would present a summary of the discussions on the following day.

Mr. Keyes explained that this résumé would take the form of a short aide-mémoire. The full report of the seminar, to be prepared later, would, of course, contain a more detailed account of the work of the seminar.

⁂

Fifth Day

Dr. Robert F. Goheen took the chair on the last day of the seminar and opened the meeting by calling on Mr. G. Daillant to present the Secretariat aide-mémoire on the preceding days' discussions.

Aide-mémoire

This *aide-mémoire* presented to you on behalf of the secretariat will of necessity be inadequate. It has not been possible to compress the whole wealth of your discussions into a few tabloid paragraphs and it would be very presumptuous on our part even to attempt to do so. Your ideas will not go into a nutshell. Nor is it possible to extract from them a set of precise recommendations and prescriptions: there will be no decalogue of obligations for the Asian universities, and it was definitely not the purpose of this seminar to try to produce one and to hand it down to an awestruck university community.

The main purpose of IAU in organizing this meeting was to provoke an exchange of ideas, arguments and information among academic colleagues from Asia and other parts of the world, and we think that this purpose has to a large extent been achieved. The full report of the seminar will try to give a fair account of your views and perhaps show how they began to converge in the course of the discussions, even if they did not merge into complete identity and wholehearted consensus.

While awaiting that report and before dealing with the three themes separately, a few general observations may be made on the work that you have just carried out. The first relates to the essential unity of the three sub-themes which you were requested to examine. Someone said that the third one should have been entitled the creative—rather than the innovatory—rôle of the university. And in a sense you have been all the time concerned with creativity. The ultimate value of a national language is perhaps that it creates a deeper intimacy between people and their own thoughts or emotions, that it enables them to master and to activate more fully their mental powers; in short, that it makes them more creative, creative of themselves, of their own culture, their own of life, their own original contribution to human civilization.

Likewise, the question of graduate employment or unemployment cannot be separated from the larger issues of development. It has been stressed that the university should not merely be an agency for change. It should not only train manpower but also help society devise the model of development best suited to its own particular needs or abilities and most likely to give satisfactory occupations to its members. Here again, in spite of the many outward constraints born of a world of inequalities and often exploitation, much will depend on creativity and on the bringing about of conditions in which nations are able to make use of their inventive powers.

The third sub-theme dealt directly with the innovatory rôle of the university. It should merely be recalled that the seminar was urged to take a message. This was that the universities of Malaysia and of other countries in the region were determined to serve their societies and to help them face their most immediate and pressing needs. At the end of the seminar and after the clarification of a number of points, it is apparent that this service is not understood as a mere compliance with instructions from what was called "the boss", but as an imaginative thinking-out of solutions to long and short-term problems. This broad conception of service may perhaps assuage misgivings that were expressed or implied during the seminar.

This is not to say, of course, that the word "creativity" is a magic formula capable of dispelling all doubts and uncertainties. It can be used as one of those "linguistic tags" referred to during the meeting and which can be stuck on all sorts of activities. A rather more detailed, although still perfunctory examination of the three topics of the seminar will show that a number of difficulties and differences of opinion remain:

The university, language and national identity

It was stressed that a national language was an important element of national identity and that it was desirable to use it as far as possible in all spheres of life, including the highest forms of education, scholarship and intellectual activity. There is no need to repeat the arguments that were made in the excellent introductory paper you had before you, but it seems obvious that a sense of identity, including national identity, is more difficult to achieve if the language of our childhood and of our early emotions, that partly determine our whole emotional life, is completely different from the language of our thoughts and rational mental activity. We can certainly acquire foreign languages and train our minds to work on different wave-lengths. But interferences and psychic distubrances are more likely to be avoided if we do that on the basis of a complete mastery of at least one language. As was pointed out, people understand faster and more thoroughly ideas expressed in their own language, rather than in a foreign one of which they have a good command.

It remains to be seen, of course, whether the ideas expressed in one language are exactly the same as those expressed in another language. As was again pointed out, language is not a neutral tool and it contributes to shape the concepts and the knowledge that it "formulates", i.e., puts into form. And it itself gives cues, on its own initiative, so to speak, it puts new thoughts on the tip of your tongue or the point of your pen. Thought is often an exploitation of the suggestions implicit in a language and this is probably true of Indian philosophy and Sanskrit for example.

A nation is therefore more likely to make an original contribution to international culture if it is able to use its own language.

This being granted, many difficulties appear in a number of situations. There are countries where a foreign language is more widely spoken than any one of the many local languages: its rejection might then be wasteful in terms of resources and more alienating to the majority of the population than its adoption as a national language. But then it perhaps ceases to be a foreign language and becomes a local variety of a larger species.

Moreover, no single local language may appear developed and rich enough to absorb the many borrowings that are necessary to make it capable of expressing what we may call in shorthand all the aspects of modern life and science. It is true, as was stressed, that a language develops as it is used and that before Dante, for example, Italian was considered a dialect only fit for peasants and uncouth noblemen, but in many cases, time and considerable resources are needed to adapt the language to the requirements of science and higher education. It may then be necessary to retain a foreign language as the medium of instruction, at least partly, or as a mode of access to scientific literature. That language must then be taught efficiently at the secondary or at the primary level and this poses new problems.

Finally there is the case of the linguistic minorities to be considered. In Denmark, we were told, the attachment of the people to the Danish language played a major rôle in the formation of the nation but then threatened to become oppressive for the minorities living in the outskirts of the kingdom. The matter is further complicated, of course, when the minorities are in effect privileged groups.

It therefore appears that no single policy can, at this stage, be advocated for all situations in spite of the theoretical and, in some cases, practical desirability of using a national language.

The university, its graduates and the labour market

Language problems have been mentioned at length because they show the complexity of the actual situations in which decisions must be made. Graduate employment problems, although they are by no means simple, may be dealt with rather more rapidly.

For one thing, they do not present everywhere the same degree of gravity. They are very acute in certain countries, such as India, and only virtual in others. In all cases, they arise from the fact that the supply of graduates grows faster or threatens to grow faster in a number of fields of study than the demand for them. This discrepancy is due to the fact that development does not take place as rapidly as was planned and expected, or that the social pressures are such that universities are led to take more students than the economy needs. Degrees are thus devalued and required even for modest occupations, with the result that more and more people seek to obtain them: this is the normal cycle of inflation. The effect can be disastrous in two respects: scarce resources are spent on people who eventually become taxi drivers or clerks and, on the other hand, academic standards are lowered under the sheer weight of numbers. In the long run, the university itself could be threatened in its very existence as a university and be degraded to the rank of a mere school. The paper which was submitted to us deals eloquently and at length with this aspect of the problem and there is no need for further elaboration.

The analysis of the problem is fairly simple but the solutions are far more difficult to find. The point was made that one should not be unduly preoccupied by the over-production of graduates. Even if some of them did not find suitable jobs immediately, they might be needed later, and could in any case contribute to the general enlightenment and education of the people.

Another interesting point was that graduates could create a demand for themselves, if they were flexible and imaginative enough and emphasis was laid upon the necessity for universities to prepare their students for mobility. But at this point we are already within the third topic. One aspect of the innovatory rôle of universities is to train people to be inventive and innovators themselves. This in turn often requires innovation in the teaching methods. Students must not be treated as passive receptacles for knowledge, they must learn, as was said, to understand processes and how to influence them.

The creation of new and shorter courses for middle-range personnel adapted to the needs of society would also be an educational innovation in many countries.

Beyond this, universities could perhaps help their society find new ways of development and not only create more jobs but perhaps also modify the existing job structures and prestige scales, find new modes of division of labour, in short, create a model less fraught with frustrations and alienations than a number of systems existing in the contemporary world.

In the meantime, limitations on entry may have to be imposed but measures must be taken to alleviate, at least, inequalities of opportunity (such as the preparatory faculties for the children of workers and peasants in the Soviet Union).

The university, its innovatory rôle in society

As was pointed out earlier, we were implicity or explicitly dealing with that problem all through our work. Its discussion has hardly left any university issue untouched: fundamental versus applied research, autonomy versus accepted dependence upon the government, neutrality versus commitment, excellence versus relevance, all these and other burning problems, such as student revolt, have been raised and examined. This baffles any attempt at summarizing. Only the full report will, hopefully, be able to do justice to the wealth and diversity of the views exchanged.

It seems, however, possible at this stage to note a few impressions. First the oppositions around which much of the academic debate revolves are to a certain extent artificial and verbal. Any applied research, for instance, has theoretical implications and is therefore in some way connected with fundamental research. Excellence is not necessarily a question of the remote and the abstract; it can be achieved at all levels, for example, in the design of a short course of study, or in a piece of very practical research. Commitment to the most urgent needs of society does not necessarily imply a neglect of its long-term concerns.

But here another impression must be recorded which may perhaps sound paradoxical: the universities in some South East Asian countries, and particularly in Malaysia, strike the outside observer as very optimistic. They are no doubt acutely aware of the difficult problems that they have to solve, but they seem quite confident that their society is susceptible of improvement on lines that correspond roughly to the policies of the government and they do not find it difficult to support its action. "Marriage" was a word suggested to define that relationship and on the whole the marriage seems to be relatively happy.

We have all been impressed by the results achieved by the Government of this country, but historical experience seems to have made some members of the seminar more guarded and more cautious. As was pointed out, the radical students of most of the developed non-Socialist countries do not believe that their societies are susceptible of improvement on their present lines of development. They think that we are rushing into a blind alley and that an ugly crash will be the result at the end. And they think that the university is wrong when it contributes to this sort of development, and equally wrong when it pretends to remain detached and neutral, for this is a disguised way of accepting the existing order and of disarming dissent by allowing it to express itself, provided it is in the accepted language of the establishment. And although the radical students are a minority, they have shaken the confidence of many academics. An atmosphere of doubt and questioning has thus been created and a new concern for values, including some of the traditional academic values, has become apparent. Here again one of the papers presents the case with great penetration and equal fairness. There is little to add to what it said. But in conclusion it may perhaps be suggested that there is not only a traditional and a modern university, as one of the participants put it, but also an emerging traditional-modern university which, after a period of heavy commitment to technology and economic growth, is now reverting to issues of meaning, purpose and quality of life.

The universities in Asia that are concerned with both development and the reactivating of their language and national cultures could perhaps readily take their place in that category.

The Chairman, Dr. Goheen, thanked Mr. Daillant and opened the discussion on the summary he had presented.

Professor El Sherif again urged that the problem of graduate employment should not be examined in too narrow a context. The threat of unemployment should not be over-dramatized. First of all, it was likely that in rapidly developing societies the present lack of jobs for graduates would very quickly be outstripped by the emergence of new employment opportunities. And why should the employment of graduates as taxi drivers or in offices be viewed with such alarm? Taxi drivers and clerks were first and foremost human beings, and it was incorrect to think that their contribution to society was necessarily limited to the mere exercise of their professional duties. The notions of supply and demand originally referred to industrial production but when applied to human beings, their effect could be restrictive and distorting.

Dr. Yip believed, however, that it was the pessimistic rather than the optimistic approach which had been under-emphasized during the discussions. The evolution of the situation in India which Professor Singh had described was no doubt an extreme case, but if a note of alarm was not sounded similar situations could easily arise elsewhere. Nothing could guarantee that in future it would be possible to create as many jobs as there were graduates There was also the element of cost and this certainly could not be ignored in countries with strictly limited resources. It was inadmissibly extravagant to provide very expensive training for people who would subsequently remain unemployed, or under-employed—for account should also be taken of disguised unemployment. It was therefore essential to provide for an appropriate measure of co-ordination between educational planning and national planning.

Encik **Ainuddin** hoped that greater prominence would be given to the educational rôle of the university. Knowledge and "know-how" were not alone sufficient to build a just society, there was need too for ethical and social values.

Professor **Singh** regretted that there was a tendency to set up new universities quite indiscriminately, simply in order to respond to certain social pressures. The university community was not strong enough to check this tendency, for which it was itself in part responsible. But if the production of large numbers of often poorly qualified graduates was to continue, the consequent accumulation of frustrations and disappointments could create an explosive situation.

The time had come for the universities to take their own affairs in hand, both individually and nationally. Much had been said about the optimum use of resources, but this was a matter in which the universities themselves were the best placed to take decisions. Societies did not always get the governments they deserved, and in any case, governments changed. To fall in line with the policies of successive governments could be to condemn oneself to incoherence. Universities should not allow themselves to be directed by the politicians, they should set their own course and in many contexts also that of society.

Language was beyond doubt a very important element of national culture, but it should not be forgotten that there were also multilingual and even multi-national states which also needed to find a proper measure of equilibrium and internal cohesion. The Soviet Union was perhaps the only example of a country which had successfully pursued a policy embracing different nationalities and different national languages.

The Chairman, Dr. **Goheen**, pointed out that although it was the business of the university to educate, too much education in certain fields (where there were few employment opportunities) might in fact lead not to the fulfilment of the individual but to frustration and bitterness. Graduate unemployment was not only a matter of economic extravagance but of human wastage and of the accumulation of disappointment and anger which could result in the creation of explosive situations.

Encik **Ainuddin** emphasized that to collaborate with the government did not mean simply to toe the line of government policy. Collaboration should be a two-way process between university and government. At least in Malaysia the Government consulted the existing universities before creating any new institutions of higher education.

Professor MULUMBA hoped that emphasis would be placed on two points: the value of co-operation between the university, government and industry in deciding on forms of education and training to correspond to actual needs, and the possibility of making systematic use of complementary and interdependent economic elements in order to forge national unity.

Professor KASEM said that the reluctance of graduates to leave the cities and towns for the villages was a major problem in Thailand and no doubt this was typical of many developing countries. Financial incentives, such as the payment of higher salaries to those who agreed to work in rural areas, would no doubt be of help. Educational planning could also be improved, and this might help to avoid the overproduction of graduates for certain professions.

Professor SANTOSO said that in Indonesia it was taken for granted that universities should play an innovatory rôle in society. The problem was to give effective expression to this rôle, particularly by seeking to ensure that courses of study would help systematically to stimulate aptitude for innovation. Efforts were now being made to devise a common programme which all first and second year students would follow in addition to the courses in their particular fields of study. It was hoped that students who received this very broadly based training would prove to be more flexible and better able to adapt themselves to new situations.

In order to relate education more closely to employment needs, an attempt was now being made in Djakarta to draw up an inventory of all existing professions (and of those which would be needed in future), to assess manpower needs in the various sectors, and to analyse the nature of different jobs. This analysis was expected to serve a dual purpose. It could help to relate professional training more closely to the requirements of professional life, and it could form the basis of a textbook of professions which could be used systematically in teaching during the final year of secondary school, thus enabling the future student to make a better informed choice of his field of study.

Mr. PINHOLT commented on paradoxes which could be inherent in the use of a language as a factor of national unification. Situations varied considerably from one country to another, as had been demonstrated by the examples of Malaysia and Zaire. It was important to remember that no matter how powerful a language might be as an instrument of cohesion, it could also become a means of division from the moment it was imposed on minority groups which did not recognize it as their own. There were situations in which national unity could be endangered precisely because in the name of the same unity attempts were made to try to destroy the original culture of some of the groups within the nation. The price of true unity was the acceptance and cultivation of diversity.

Professor FISCIAN pointed out that although students were collectively often ready to play an active rôle in society, individually they rarely had of very clear idea of what they wanted to do. Their choice of field of study might be almost a matter of chance, some only went to university because their parents wished them to, or because they were attracted by the prestige of being a student. Here were some of the factors likely to contribute to graduate unemployment. Information bureaux able to provide information about different careers and professions could help students make better choices and more realistic decisions.

Dr. MEI observed that during the seminar there had been a certain polarization of opinions. But it would be incorrect to say that one group was right and the other wrong. Universities worked in different social environments and these could not but lead to the formulation of different attitudes and strategies. Once the fundamental social choices had been made (for example, between socialism and liberalism) the first task of the university should be to identify the problems to be solved and to evolve appropriate strategies for this.

Mr. CRAIG drew attention to a report, issued recently by the University of Birmingham, which illustrated the delicate balance that universities should try to maintain between the demands of society and the obligations which their own functions placed on them. The report claimed that the university ought not to remain indifferent to the major moral concerns of society, but should in fact be a source of leadership for political change, placing its specialized knowledge at the disposal of the community. Yet it should do nothing which would bring it into conflict with its basic functions or menace its autonomy.

Mrs. MEI suggested that if graduates were to be sent to work in rural areas it would be useful to try to send married couples and to pay the wife on the same basis as the husband. Their services to the community could be complementary and specially valuable.

Though IAU seminars were in many respects representative, they might be improved further by the inclusion of at least one woman participant.

The Rev. Father TORRALBA drew attention to one matter which had perhaps not been brought out clearly in the discussion. In rehabilitating themselves in a national language many nations were no doubt seeking to rid themselves more effectively of a former colonial presence and thus to make absolute the divorce.

One should not be afraid to repeat that the relationship between the university and society should be marked by a deep sense of commitment. The era of the ivory tower belonged to past history. It was in fact the global commitment of the university to society which imposed on it a duty not to squander scarce resources and therefore obliged it to follow a strictly selective admissions policy.

In considering the matter of graduate unemployment, insufficient attention had been paid to the question of women. Yet many more women than men were looking for work. It was certainly true that many graduates viewed some jobs with disdain. This was essentially a problem of education and one which the university itself should tackle.

The Chairman, Dr. GOHEEN, said that universities were certainly justified in following a selective admissions policy but only if compensatory measures were taken in favour of the underprivileged groups, as had been done in the Soviet Union, for example.

Dr. YIP recalled that reference had been made to a "marriage" between the university and the Government in Malaysia. A similar "marriage" in Indonesia had already been productive, giving birth to new development plans. Co-operation of this kind should be encouraged and developed.

Dr. MEI said that the university should nevertheless preserve a certain measure of detachment. If it did not rise above the conflicts of the day it would be unable to exercise its critical rôle.

The Chairman, Dr. Goheen, thanked the speakers and called on the Secretary-General.

Mr. Keyes explained the arrangements foreseen for the preparation of the report of the seminar which would, of course, be sent to the participants before being published.

On behalf of all participants Mr. Keyes warmly thanked the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Malaya, Professor Ungku Aziz, and asked him to convey the sincere gratitude of IAU to the Prime Minister, to the members of the Government, and to all who had contributed in one way or another to the success of the seminar.

Professor Ungku Aziz thanked the participants who had made long journeys to come to Malaysia. The University counted it an honour to receive them as its guests.

Professor Singh said that all participants would wish to express their thanks to IAU and to their Malaysian hosts.

Dr. Goheen then declared the seminar closed.

APPENDICES

PARTICIPANTS

Encik Ainuddin bin Abdul Wahid,
Rector, Institut Teknoloji Kebangsaan Malaysia
Datuk Dr. Ariffin bin Ngah Marzuki,
Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Professor Ungku A. Aziz,
Vice-Chancelor, Universiti Malaya
Dr. Cyril E. Fiscian,
Acting Head, Department of Psychology, University of Ghana
Dr. Robert F. Goheen,
President Emeritus, Princeton University
Professor Hamzah Sendut,
Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Sains Malaysia
Dr. Kasem Suwanagul,
Dean, Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University
Professor J.D. Legge,
Chairman, Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University
Dr. Y.P. Mei,
President, New Asia College, Chinese University of Hong Kong
Professor Mulumba Lukoji,
Faculty of Law, Université nationale du Zaïre
Professor Morihiki Okatsu,
Faculty of Education, University of Tokyo
Mr. Jens Pinholt,
Department of Ethnography, Aarhus Universitet
Dr. Mohd. Rashdan bin Haji Baba,
Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia
Professor K.A. Rybnikov,
Department of Mathematics, State University of Moscow
Dr. Seah Chee Meow,
Department of Political Science, University of Singapore
Professor Hassan el Sherif,
Deputy President, Cairo University
Professor H.L. Singh,
Head, Department of History, Banaras Hindu University
Professor Slamet Iman Santoso,
Deputy Rector, University of Indonesia

Guests

- Tan Sri Mr. Justice Mohd. Suffian bin Hashim,
  - Chairman, Higher Educational Advisory Council, Malaysia
  - Pro-Chancellor, Universiti Malaya
- Datuk Dr. S.M.A. Alhady,
  - Chairman of Council, Universiti Malaya
- Dr. Tan Chee Khoon,
  - Member of Council, Universiti Malaya

Observers

Associate Members of IAU:

- Association of African Universities
  - Prof. Malumba Lukoji, Université nationale du Zaïre
- Association of Arab Universities
  - Prof. Hassan el Sherif, Deputy President, Cairo University
- Association of Commonwealth Universities
  - Mr. T. Craig, Assistant Secretary
- Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning
  - Prof. Ungku A. Aziz, President
- International Federation of Catholic Universities
  - Rev. Luis F. Torralba, S.J., Rector, Xavier University

Host country:

- Professor Zainal Abidin bin Abdul Wahid,
  - Department of History, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
- Encik Annis Ahmad,
  - President, Students' Union, Universiti Malaya
- Encik Zulkifli Hj. Ahmad,
  - President, Malay Language Society, Universiti Malaya

Unesco:

- Mr. Raja Roy Singh,
  - Director, Regional Office for Education in Asia

Regional Institute of Higher Education and Development (RIHED)

- Dr. Yip Yat Hoong,
  - Director

International Association of Universities

Professor V. Merikoski
Mr. H.M.R. Keyes
Mr. D.J. Aitken
Mr. G. Daillant

Seminar Secretariat, Universiti Malaya

Encik Lim Chung Tat, Registrar
Encik F. Gul, Organizing Secretary
Encik V.T. Ratnam, Assistant Secretary
Cik Puah Yoke Chin, Assistant Secretary

WORKING PROGRAMME

Monday, 29 January

Inaugural Session

Introduction of Theme:
The University, Language and National Identity

Discussion of Theme

Tuesday, 30 January

Introduction of Theme:
The University, its Graduates and the Labour Market

Discussion of Theme

Wednesday, 31 January

Introduction of Theme:
The University, its Innovatory Rôle in Society

Discussion of Theme

Thursday, 1 February

Open Session

Discussion with invited Observers

Friday, 2 February

General Appraisal of Discussions

Closing Session

OUTLINE FOR PAPER ON
THE UNIVERSITY, ITS INNOVATORY ROLE IN SOCIETY

BY

DR. Z. SALAZAR
Department of History, University of the Philippines

Despite its implicit voluntarism, the subject cannot be viewed even in the optative mood. The university's rôle can be determined only in terms and in cognizance of the forces that give society movement and direction. As an "established" and even "adjuvant" social institution, the university is normally inclined to strive for equilibrium, for stability. In this sense, its main preoccupation as "a citadel of Truth" is to conserve what it considers or wants to be "eternal"—i.e., the social edifice whose sustenance it gets and gives in return. It is only when society itself is in a state of change or some creative tension that the university is placed before the dilemma, the responsibility of assuming or rejecting an innovatory rôle in society—i.e., the task of discerning the way or at least clarifying the options that society is loath or too wary to take or even consider.

The university in the Philippines has given in its long history different responses to this existential challenge. During the Spanish era, its innovatory rôle was exhausted in the unintended accullurative aspects of missionary and colonial expansion before it became transmuted into an obdurate resistance to change, the tragic defence of an obsolete imperial idea in the face of the onrushing reality of a nascent nationality. In the American period, its almost purely innovative rôle was as ambiguous as the conjunction of interests between the new colonial masters and the "triumphant" anti-Spanish élite, enlarging their common domain of cooperation and dominance in thought, polity, economy and industry.

With the establishment of the Republic in 1946, the university passed through a period of unquestioning acceptance of its inherited "colonial" goals. It was only around 1960 that a continually intensified quest began in the university for goals more consonant with the silhouette of the nation then as now in the process of being defined. This task of making the university "Filipino" or, rather, that of making the university responsive to the actual and envisioned Filipino society lent itself to varied interpretations, ranging from the mystical-personalist to the materialist-populist through the technocratic-élitist. The key word was "relevance"—i.e., to the nation's status (or lack of it) as an ex- (or neo-) colony, to its underdeveloped (or developing) situation as an economy, to the Filipino people considered as "mass", "grassroots" or "corporate entity". Was the university to continue as a factory for the political, commercial, industrial and religious bureaucracies and adjuncts? Or was it to be concerned with the renewal of society itself, changing its very structure and relations in co-operation with the "masses", the "grassroots" or the "corporate people", depending upon the ideological direction? The debate seems to have led to a consensus, that of involving the university in social change, the restructuring of society itself. The opinions differ, however, on the nature of the renovated society and on the means to be utilized to arrive at it.

In the final analysis, the university must and will have an innovatory rôle to play. It may even have to be given that rôle in the interest of national welfare, in the struggle against some threat to the nation. The university can be an agent of change only in so far as society itself is already in the grips of change. In the end, its potency for effecting change is only a function of the vigour or the rigour of society or sections of it. Which is but one way of saying that the Academe is just as fragile or as invincible as the society it participates in creating. A people always deserves whatever Academe it allows to prevail. And vice-versa, we may add. But that is probably giving too much capacity for action to the university as distinct from the nation it is supposed to reflect.

NOTE ON THE UNIVERSITY, LANGUAGE AND NATIONAL IDENTITY

BY

DR. KASEM SUWANAGUL
Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University

The Thai nation was founded some 800 years ago. The cultural homogeneity of the people as well as the freedom from foreign domination has made the Thai take the question of national identity for granted. Geographically, Thailand is divided into four regions—the central, the north, the northeast and the south. The Thai national language, the language spoken by the people of the central part, is also spoken or at least understood by the majority of the people in the other parts of the country. There are, however, three different dialects spoken by the common people of the north, northeast and the south. Although the sense of national identity among the people residing in different regions and speaking different dialects has so far not become a problem, there are at times feelings of being neglected, of being left alone and, to some extent, of being looked down upon on the part of the people living outside the central part of the country, particularly those in the northeastern region. Of interest is the fact that it is not the difference of dialects that gives rise to such feelings but it is rather the difference of intellectual levels that is responsible for this misunderstanding. The main cause of this intellectual discrepancy is economic rather than political or cultural in nature.

Before the Second World War, development priorities were given to the central region. For example, all universities and good schools were established in Bangkok; irrigation projects were carried out in the central part. Although there had long been the railway system linking all parts of the country, there were only a few roads which would make the remote parts of the country accessible. The people outside the central part are left comparatively backward and the result is that they are comparatively poor. Poverty makes education less accessible to them and the sense of intellectual inferiority has developed. If the development of this feeling is left unchecked, it will surely drive the people of the outer regions further away and the unconscious sense of national identity will be in real jeopardy. This is where the university can come in and play a significant rôle by raising the intellectual levels of the people, particularly in the outer regions of the country. This can be done not by doing away with the dialects but by bringing higher education to the different parts of the country. This idea was conceived and implemented a decade ago. At present, apart from the seven universities located in Bangkok, there is one university in each of the outer regions. It is believed that if the problem of intellectual inferiority is to be solved, the universities must not confine their activities within their own campuses and to only a handful of bright young people. In the absence of other responsible agencies, the universities must help improve the intellectual standard of the common people by making them more knowledgeable. New ideas, new knowledge must be transmitted to the less fortunate people even, at this first and immediate stage, in their own dialects.

If the term language is to be conceived in a broader sense to include not only the verbal message but also the idea or understanding to be transmitted, then the Thai universities will have a far more significant rôle to play in regard to preserving the sense of national identity among the Thai living in different parts. When the first university was founded in Thailand some 80 years ago, the main purpose was to train young Thai for government service. Most of the lecturers were graduates of western universities who brought back with them western ideas and knowledge which in turn were transmitted to their students without proper digestion. The result was that what they taught was highly irrelevant to the local condition of the country. This is understandable since at that initial stage, the introduction of western ideas and knowledge into the country was the immediate need and there was no time to modify them to fit the far different conditions of Thailand. The lapse of time since the inception of the first university has brought no improvement to the situation. To a large extent, the university curricula are still designed by copying from the bulletins of western universities. Raw western ideas are still imposed upon the students by their western-trained professors. Instruction is still almost the sole function of the university. The research which would make instruction relevant to the local condition is almost negligible. This results in alienating the students from the majority of the people and they become élitist with imported ideas and ways of communication. It has been accepted that the university has the main function to train future leaders for the country. If this is what the graduates are like, one wonders whether the university is producing the wrong kind of leaders for the country. To develop or to preserve the sense of national identity, leaders must be able to establish a close dialogue with the people. They must know the local condition and be able to speak the "language" of the people in order to get their ideas across. To train this new kind of leader, curricula will have to be redesigned not by copying those from the west but by adapting them to suit local situations. University staff must acquaint themselves with the problems of their own country by such means as research activities. Closer relations between professors and their students must be encouraged.

The university can no longer afford to confine itself to the ivory tower of the academic world. It must come down to meet the people. The professors must know their country well and make themselves understood by the people. Their students must be so trained that they can communicate with the people. Only when this is done, the university can claim that it has contributed to the promotion of the sense of national identity.

NOTE ON TERTIARY EDUCATION AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BY

DR. SEAH CHEE-MEOW
Department of Political Science, University of Singapore

(The following is an abridged version of Dr. Seah's original text)

There are two universities in Singapore, namely, the predominantly English-medium University of Singapore and the Chinese-medium Nanyang University. The former was formally given university status in 1949 although its origins could be traced to two other institutions which were established much earlier; Nanyang University was founded in 1957 by the enterprising local Chinese trading community as an expression of cultural pride and also as an avenue of upward mobility for students taught in the Chinese-medium schools. In this paper we shall restrict ourselves to the rôles of the University of Singapore in national development, although references will occasionally be made to Nanyang for purposes of drawing comparisons.

Part I: Development of the University of Singapore

When Sir Stamford Raffles founded Singapore, one of his prime concerns was the need to introduce a sound educational system. In one of his minutes, he wrote:

> ...education must keep pace with commerce in order that its benefits may be assured and its evils avoided... Shall we not consider it one of our first duties to afford the means of education to surrounding countries and thus render our stations not only the seats of commerce but of literature and the arts.

Tertiary education in Singapore as such had a rather late development. An initial effort to establish a tertiary institution took place towards the close of the 19th Century when the Straits Settlements Government set up a medical school to train "natives" as "apothecaries" (assistant surgeons). This failed after a half-hearted start, but the idea of a proper tertiary institution was revived by the non-European trading community. Led by Tan Jiak Kim a total of Singapore $80,000 was raised. In a petition to the Governor, the local merchants urged the colonial government to establish a medical school in the colony.

The reluctant colonial government agreed to revive the project. Opened in 1905, the medical school, which occupied "discarded buildings previously forming part of a female lunatic asylum", was to train students who would later assist the British medical officers in the colony. In 1916, the General Medical Council of London decided to accord licentiate status to the school. Consequently, students on successful completion of the five-year medical training could practise in any part of the British Empire.

While the medical school was being established, the local trading community continued to agitate for the establishment of more institutions of higher learning. Following the centenary celebrations of the founding of Singapore, moves were initiated to set up a parallel college to teach the arts and the sciences and in 1928, Raffles College was founded as a result of public subscription and a government grant. Unlike the medical school, Raffles College was not the responsibility of the government even though the latter was strongly represented on the College's council.

Raffles College's initial rôle was to provide a steady stream of teachers for the secondary schools which were then set up. The scope of employment for the graduands was expanded in 1933 when the colonial government created the Straits Settlements Civil Service to enable Raffles College diploma holders to fill the junior administrative posts in the bureaucracy.

In 1939, a commission under the chairmanship of Sir William McClean was set up to appraise the future of these two colleges. This commission recommended that the two colleges be transformed into a university college with affiliation to an English university. No progress was, however, made in this direction mainly because of the outbreak of the Second World War.

Following the end of the War, Sir Raymond Priestley visited the two colleges and his visit was followed shortly by the Carr-Saunders Commission. The latter considered the standard of education offered in the two colleges to be of a sufficiently high level to warrant the granting of full university status. In accordance with the recommendation of the Commission the two institutions were merged to form the University of Malaya on 8 October 1949. It was to serve not only Singapore but also Malaya (and to a certain extent, Sarawak and British North Borneo) even though the two territories were politically separated and were at different stages of constitutional emancipation.

The University of Malaya was regarded as a tangible expression of the close ties which existed between the two territories. Nevertheless, political considerations were constantly brought to bear upon the young institution. The attempt to re-site the university from Singapore to Johore Bahru (presumably a convenient midway point between Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaya), could be traced *inter alia* to the interplay of conflicting political forces and nationalist sentiment. While the move was aborted, the clamour for a university to be established in Malaya gained widespread sympathy and support in that territory. This led to the establishment of a branch of the university on the outskirts of Kuala Lumpur. By 1957, there were two divisions of the University of Malaya. Both, for reasons of convenience and feasibility, were run as autonomous units, although co-ordination was effected by the appointment of a single vice-chancellor and the creation of **a** common university council represented equally by the two divisions. It was thus a matter of time before the split into two autonomous universities began. This move finally materialized on 1 January 1962, when the Singapore division came to be known as the University of Singapore. The Kuala Lumpur division retained the name of the University of Malaya.

The University of Singapore is largely financed by the government. Recurrent and development expenditures have been increasing because the university has initiated an expansion programme which *inter alia* aims at increasing student intake and improving the quality of its facilities. This dependency on government grants may inhibit the decision-making process in the university (requests for funds must be approved by the Treasury), but the situation is not that serious because of the recognition that the university has an important rôle to play in the development of the country. It is in acknowledgment of this important function that the government has continued to extend ever-increasing grants for the running of the institution. Thus, in Session 1971/72, the government contributed 85 per cent of the university's budget of Singapore $20million.

Part II: Responses to Rôle-fulfilment

From the brief description above it is apparent that the growth of the university has been influenced by political changes and events found in Malaya and Singapore. It could not override political considerations operating in these two territories. Yet, despite its relative inability to "buffer" the political "storms", the university has continued to perform its rôles in an efficient manner.

Manpower Provision Orientation

(a) The Output Factor: The provision of high level manpower has been the prime function of the University of Singapore. This task has been complicated by two factors. First, as explained earlier, the university was initially established to service both territories (and to a certain extent, Borneo). While the demand by Malaya (and now, Malaysia) on the University of Singapore may progressively decrease with the establishment of more institutions of higher learning in that country, nevertheless a sizeable number of Malaysian students continue to pursue courses at the University of Singapore. In 1968, 21 per cent of the student enrolment was from Malaysia. In a sense, therefore, the University of Singapore's assessment of manpower requirements is complicated because of the need to take into account this factor. Secondly, the University of Singapore has to alter the composition of its manpower supply rather rapidly to suit the pace of constitutional and economic development in the country. In the 1950s, the university had to produce a large number of arts and science graduates who could be rapidly absorbed into the Civil Service which was then in the process of deliberate localization. The smoothness with which localization was carried out indicated in a way the ability of the university to adjust the manpower supply accordingly. Besides localization, the university (ever since the present government took over office in 1959) has had to help expedite the economic transformation of the country from an entrepôt base to a servicing and industrial centre of the region. In terms of educational planning the university has to shift its priorities in favour of the disciplines (like engineering and business administration) which are in demand.

There has been a steady increase in student enrolment. Compared to the 645 students in 1949 there were in 1971 4,706 graduate and undergraduate students, or an increase of nearly 730 per cent. In 1949 there were three faculties; in 1971 there were 12 faculties and schools.

In 1949, medical and related disciplines had the bulk of the student population, about 62 per cent. This situation could be attributed to four factors. First, the larger student enrolment could be due to the longer period of study which such students would have to undergo (as compared to science and arts) and hence a slower "turnover". Secondly, there was a dire shortage of medical officers, owing partly to the devastation of the Second World War and the uneven dispersion of population over a large area (that is, Malaya and Singapore). Thirdly, the medical profession had been accorded high social esteem by the local population. Finally, the medical school had a longer history of development.

Since then, the enrolment percentages in the medical disciplines have declined. This situation has arisen partly because of the rapid development of the medical school in Malaysia and partly because of the relatively large number of medical doctors in Singapore. The current doctor-population ratio in Singapore is 1:1,300 which is comparable to that in some of the developed nations in the west.

More significant are the changes in the enrolment patterns of the arts students. In 1949, about 26 per cent were pursuing courses in this faculty. This rose to a peak 47 per cent in 1957 but fell to 16 per cent by 1971.

The rise in the early years could be related to the demand for graduates to fill the administrative, executive and educational positions in the bureaucracy. There was general acceptance of the fact that the university would have to produce more of such graduates to fill not only those posts vacated by the expatriate officers but also the needs of an expanding bureaucracy. The decline in the percentage of student enrolment in this faculty after 1957 could in part be related to the establishment of the law faculty and to the formal establishment of the school of accountancy and business administration.

The student enrolment in the science faculty was the smallest of the three faculties in 1949, with only 12 per cent of the students. Over the years a gradual though perceptible increase took place and the percentage rose to 31 in 1967. As in the arts faculty, it has dropped in the last few years as a result of developments such as the establishment of the school of architecture and building management and the faculty of engineering in 1969.

From another perspective, the changing patterns in enrolment figures show that the capabilities of the university in providing higher manpower have been considerably strengthened and that it has the resources to provide specialized and highly differentiated skilled manpower required by the society. The disciplines with the largest rate of growth over the last few years have been business administration (and accountancy), engineering and architecture.

These rapid changes in emphasis of the various disciplines of study have a de-stabilizing effect on the administration of the various faculties. Some, because of their growing importance, expand rapidly and numerous administrative measures have to be undertaken to ensure that the increases in staff and student intake are integrated into the curriculum structure.

Since the manpower requirements in the country are changing rapidly, the university will have to follow suit.

Although the changes in enrolment pattern may reflect a conscious policy of the university administration to gear the output of graduates to societal needs, other factors also play contributory rôles. The first may be related to the educational system in the country which has, over the last decade, shifted its emphasis from "academic" to technical training. Secondly, incoming university students are consciously aware of the job opportunities of the various disciplines and they tend to enter those which prove to be more remunerative.

(b) The Placement Factor: In the Register of the Guild of Graduates, there were in 1972 a total number of 10,197 graduates. Of this total, 1,500 graduated between 1910 and 1961. In the last four years the university produced 4,897 or approximately 45 per cent of the total graduates listed in the register.

There are no comprehensive studies on the career patterns of the university's graduates, although a few and partial studies have been embarked on lately. For the purpose of this paper, we shall confine ourselves to three selected services of the bureaucracy and appraise the extent to which these sectors are dependent on the University of Singapore for personnel. While the analysis may not be representative of the demands of the country on the university, the results can serve to indicate the recruitment trends in the major sectors of the bureaucracy.

In the Administrative Service the graduates of the University of Singapore form an important component of the total personnel. In 1957, they constituted 39 per cent of the total personnel, or 53 per cent of those with university degrees. By 1971, the corresponding figures were 79 and 87 per cent. A more prominent trend was even noted in the medical service. In 1957, for example, 62 per cent of the 140 staff members were graduates of the University of Singapore. The percentages of those with exclusively foreign degrees continued to dwindle as the increase in staff strength was met mainly by graduates of this university.

It is in the Public Works Department that the university's impact is least felt. Most of the senior personnel were trained overseas. This situation arose mainly because the late establishment of the engineering faculty and hence, the consequent dependence on foreign-trained personnel. However, with the large student enrolment in the engineering faculty, this overwhelming dependence on foreign universities should be reversed.

The Research Orientation

Parallel with the growth of the undergraduate programme has been the development of research facilities. Teachers in the university are expected to undertake research projects which would contribute to the pool of knowledge and the research function of the university has also been considerably strengthened with the expansion of the graduate schools. The increasing number of postgraduate students coincided with the growing demand for specialist skills and in the 1971/72 session there were no fewer than 250 higher degree and 20 postgraduate diploma students engaged in research in various disciplines.

The university is no longer primarily concerned with undergraduate training and several faculties have now become centres of specialist training as well. Local medical graduates, for example, can now dispense with the need to travel abroad for studies leading to various professional accreditations.

The contribution of the research activities to national development can be seen from two dimensions. In the first place, the university is able to provide highly specialized skill urgently required by the nation. The availability of specialized graduate courses like urban planning, for example, helps to alleviate the acute demand for such professional skills so vital to the success of the country's massive urban renewal programme. From another perspective, the research activities have led to an interest in local and regional problems. In the social sciences, for example, many pieces of research have been done to appraise the government's nation-building programme. Most of these studies have policy-implications and they provide the governmental agencies an objective means to assess the effectiveness of their policies. The educational system in the country, for example, has benefited largely because researches in the humanities and social sciences have led to a new series of textbooks being made available for the school children. These texts have rectified an important imbalance in the school curriculum of the pre-independence period which gave undue emphasis to the contributions of the colonial powers.

Despite the emphasis on research functions, there are two major obstacles which occasionally confront the university in the pursuance of this rôle. The first relates to the choice of the research problems and the question of co-operation between the researchers and the governmental agencies. Partly because of a communication gap and partly because of different conceptions of research interests and priorities, researchers in the university sometimes may not be able to identify those research problems which are viewed with urgency by the governmental agencies, a feature which often causes frustration to both parties.

The other problem which researchers encounter pertains to publication. Because of the tendency to give more credit to papers which are published in well-known foreign journals, scholars in the university tend to send their papers abroad. Consequently, their research topics and interests are dictated by the preferences and policies of these journals. Some researchers may shun research problems of a localized interest and concentrate on other research areas which conform with the policies of foreign publishers.

There are no easy answers to these two problems. Co-operation between the university and the governmental agencies is largely a personal matter to be left between the individual researcher and the bureaucrats. Since governmental agencies realize the importance of research (the larger agencies, for example, have their own research units), a *modus vivendi* agreeable to both parties may be achieved.

The solution to the second problem lies in the cultivation of a tradition of local scholarship. This is a long-term process which requires *inter alia* an expanding reading public in the country. Already moves like the setting up of a university press and the initiation of journals have been made. Insistence on a high level of scholarship has led to several journals being well received abroad.

The Service Orientation

Like most universities, the University of Singapore has also to provide the leadership rôle in the country and in the process, to shape some of the social and cultural values of society. This has been emphasized by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Toh Chin Chye, who declared in a public speech that the university should make itself a "distinctive institution consonant with what Singapore stands for as a multi-racial and poly-cultural society".

At the national level the academic community of the university has been actively engaged in numerous activities which influence the political, economic and social development of the country. In 1970, for example, two Cabinet Ministers, five Members of Parliament and three ambassadors were members of the university staff. Others have been appointed to para-statal bodies, commissions and committees and have been periodically consulted on important issues affecting the welfare of the community. No fewer than 140 of the 427 staff members in 1971 were appointed to serve various national and professional bodies in the country.

The service orientation of the university is also extended to the society in other, though less conspicuous ways. The Department of Extra-Mural Studies was set up in 1966 as part of the university's community service. In 1971, 136 courses were organized and attracted a total number of 6,342 adults.

Besides the staff, the student body has also strengthened the service orientation of the university by initiating welfare projects. Work camps are an annual feature of the students' activities and give the participants invaluable insights into the problems facing the less privileged sections of the population. Students are also engaged in fund-raising campaigns for several charitable organizations.

Part III: Problems in Educational Planning

In the process of fulfilling these three rôles, the university has come under the close scrutiny of the public. The most notable observers and critics of the university's functions are the members of the political leadership. The university is financed by the government, a factor which makes the latter feel that is has vested interest in the way in which the university is managed. Moreover, the ruling leadership is very conscious of the changes that are transforming the country. The university, as the nation's main source of intellectual leadership and supplier of trained manpower, has been looked upon to provide the impetus to the many changes occurring in the country.

On the other hand, the university administrators are not unaware of the criticisms. The present Vice-Chancellor, for example, is a senior Cabinet Minister and he is acutely aware of the change which he feels the university should adopt. For this paper, two major criticisms are isolated for discussion: (i) the identity question and (ii) the philosophy of curriculum structuring.

The Identity Question

The identity question revolves round the type of institution the university should seek to become. Established during the colonial era, it is occasionally criticized for failing to promote and project national aspirations. This is not to suggest that the university has lagged behind in rôle-fulfilment, but rather that it can further improve its rôle-fulfilment capabilities *vis-à-vis* the national development of the country.

One aspect that comes under severe criticism is the attitude retained by some members of the teaching staff. The Vice-Chancellor urging the need for "academic decolonization" called upon the staff to divest themselves of the Euro-centric attitudes and prejudices and look at the problems of emerging countries through the cultures, values and political attitudes of the peoples concerned. This assertion is not novel because universities in the developing countries are usually expected to reflect as well as to lead their societies in social change. As an international report* commented:

> All countries in the region are concerned to develop a national identity which involves, as part of this process, a flowering of literature and creative arts and the adaptation of traditional aesthetic and moral values to economic exigencies in such a way that they retain their essential spirit and yet interact constructively with the needs and impacts of technological and social change.

In the case of the University of Singapore, this situation, it has been asserted, is compounded partly because the institution has been largely dependent on expatriate staff. This is believed to have made the university less sensitive to the tumultuous changes which the Singapore society has been undergoing. The university (that is, the staff and students) has occasionally been charged with side-tracking important societal and national issues and with emphasizing matters which the government feels are of little relevance. In a sense, an operative factor behind the government's criticism is its desire that the university should take the initiative and provide the leadership rôle in the country's developmental process.

The second aspect of the criticism focuses on language and the cultural identity of the university. The University of Singapore uses English as its medium of instruction. This language has been retained on purely functional grounds: English is the universal language in the fields of technology and commerce. To adopt another medium would lead to unnecessary wastage of time and resources, as books and journals would have to be translated while students and staff members would have to learn the new medium. On the other hand, the university administration is acutely aware of the need to enable those educated in other language media to enter the university provided they are suitably qualified. Besides language competence, the university administration is anxious that its students should be attuned to the multi-cultural tempo of Singapore society. To rectify the first problem, the university has initiated classes in remedial English to assist the non-English educated to attain a relatively high command of that language. The first move was made in the 1959/60 Session by the Faculty of Science when 40 Chinese-educated candidates were given special assistance in the English language. More recently, the English Department has conducted remedial language courses for those incoming students of the Engineering Faculty who may require such facilities.

---

* *Higher Education and Development in Southeast Asia, Summary Report and Conclusions*, Unesco/IAU, 1965.

On the question of arousing the cultural awareness of the students (lest they be cut off from the community), the university administration has embarked on a two-pronged strategy. The first has been to encourage the learning of the other official languages in Singapore. In 1969, a language laboratory was established in the university so that students could learn various languages (including the four official languages of Singapore).

With regard to the second strategy, the university has in the last academic year established a department of music (within the faculty of arts and social sciences). It will eventually offer degree courses in music and it is hoped that its existence will help to enrich the musical awareness of the student population and contribute to the cultural heritage of the country.

Broad Education versus Narrow Specialization

Apart from the question of identity, the University of Singapore is also reappraising what it regards to be the fundamental aims of tertiary education. Under the old degree structure, a student was exposed to three courses in the first year and specialized in one or two disciplines in the subsequent years. Theoretically, the student would be equipped with the technical skills of a particular discipline as well as the analytical capabilities to delve into other fields of knowledge; in practice, this happy balance may not always materialize. Because of the high market value of university education and the acquisition of a good university degree, students have been known to confine their interests and attention only to their respective courses of study in the hope of excelling in the examinations. While no large-scale surveys have been conducted to look into the ramifications of this at the university, observations made in other countries have shown that students exposed only to a narrow field of specialization tended to become helpless when placed in a different intellectual environment. The University of Singapore has since embarked on fundamental changes in the curriculum structure. In arts and social sciences, for example, the students will not be allowed to specialize in any one discipline until the fourth or Honours year. Through the adoption of this policy, the university administrators hope to avoid the pitfalls which accompany narrow-based specialization and because of the broader base of training, to promote a more socially informed and "educated" group of graduates.

Closely linked to the idea of a broadly based education has been the concept of inter-disciplinary training. At the University of Singapore, students in the arts faculty will have to do a two-year course in general science in addition to the normal courses; in the Science stream, students will also have to take an additional integrated course in the social sciences.

Conclusion

The above discussion shows that the University of Singapore has an important rôle to play in national development. More specifically, the university has also been supplementing quantitative developments by qualitative implications so as to strengthen its contributions. The resolution of the numerous teething problems of Nanyang University and the government's recognition of its degrees may affect the singular relationship currently enjoyed by the University of Singapore, especially in the field of trained manpower supply.

It is difficult to quantify the contributions of the University of Singapore to the national effort. In very broad terms we can say that the university has provided the country with the political leadership and bureaucratic skills so relevant in the changeover from a colonial dependency to an independent republic. In the economic field, the university is helping the government's planned programme of accelerated industrialization by altering the supply of manpower in favour of disciplines which are in demand. In the field of social development, there exists a close identification between the university and society. It is aware of the need to empathize with, and influence, community demands.

The university's success in the three rôles outlined above, especially in manpower supply, has been made possible as a result of numerous policy changes that have been initiated from time to time. Viewed against the backdrop of political and constitutional changes, the university can be said to have shown a high degree of adaptability in its objective to satisfy national needs.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1, rue Miollis, 75015 Paris

PERIODICAL

- • *Bulletin of the International Association of Universities.*

Since 1953. Quarterly: February, May, August, and November.

REFERENCE WORKS

International Handbook of Universities.
Fifth edition, 1971, xi + 1216 pages.
Sixth edition, 1974 (in preparation).

World List: Universities, Other Institutions of Higher Education, University Organizations 1973-1974.
Eleventh Edition, 1973, xviii + 482 pages.

Collection of Agreements Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1966, vii + 655 pages (reprint).
Second volume 1961-1972 (in preparation).

Documents Concerning the Equivalence of University Qualifications.
1957. 280 loose leaves (microfilm).

PAPERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES

1. *Three Aspects of University Development Today.* 1953. 46 pages.
2. *Health at the University.* 1954. 76 pages.
3. *Student Mental Health.* 1958. 76 pages.
4. **University Education and Public Service.* 1959. 151 pages.
5. **The Interplay of Scientific and Cultural Values in Higher Education Today.* 1960. 81 pages.
6. **The Expansion of Higher Education.* 1960. 117 pages.
7. *University Autonomy — Its Meaning Today.* 1965. 139 pages.
8. *The Administration of Universities.* 1967. xiii + 99 pages.
9. *International University Co-operation.* 1969. xvi + 161 pages.
10. *The University and the Needs of Contemporary Society.* 1970. xv + 81 pages.
11. *Problems of Integrated Higher Education - An International Case Study of the Gesamthochschule.* 1972. 85 pages.
12. *The Social Responsibility of the University in Asian Countries - Obligations and Opportunities.* 1973, 124 pages.

STUDIES AND REPORTS

The Staffing of Higher Education.
1960. 169 pages.

Some Economic Aspects of Educational Development in Europe.
1961. 144 pages.

Formal Programmes of International Co-operation between University Institutions.
1960. 39 pages in-4°, (published by Unesco)

Report of a Meeting of Heads of African Institutions of Higher Education, Khartoum, 16-19 *September* 1963.
1964. 107 pages.

* *Report of the International Conference of Universities, Nice, December* 1950
1951. 162 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Second General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Istanbul, September 1955. 1956. 232 pages.

Report of Proceedings, Third General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Mexico, September 1960. 1961. 224 pages.

Report of the Fourth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Tokyo, 31 *August*-6 *September* 1965. 1966. 264 pages.

Report of the Fifth General Conference of the International Association of Universities, Montreal, 30 *August*-5 *September* 1970.
1971. 291 pages.

Administrative Reports of International Association of Universities: 1951-1954. 1955. 40 pages.

Idem: 1955-1959. 1960. 58 pages.

Idem: 1960-1964. 1965. 129 pages.

Idem: 1965-1969. 1970. 117 pages.

* Published with the financial assistance of Unesco.

JOINT UNESCO-IAU RESEARCH PROGRAMME IN HIGHER EDUCATION [1]

The International Study of University Admissions:

Vol. I: *Access to Higher Education,* by Frank Bowles. 1963. 212 pages.

Vol. II: *National Studies.* 1965. 648 pages.

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia:

Summary Report. 1965. 94 pages.

Higher Education and Development in South-East Asia:

Vol. I: *Director's Report,* by Howard Hayden. 1967. 508 pages.

Vol. II: *Country Profiles.* 1967. 615 pages.

Vol. III: Part 1. *High-level manpower for development,* by Guy Hunter 1967. 184 pages.

Part. 2. *Language policy and higher education,* by Richard Noss. 1967. 216 pages.

Teaching and Learning: An Introduction to New Methods and Resources in Higher Education.

by N. MacKenzie, M. Eraut, H.C. Jones. 1970. 209 pages.

---

[1] Reports issued under this Programme are produced jointly by Unesco and IAU and may be purchased through national distributors of Unesco publications.